

**MILITARY CHAPLAINS'**

**REVIEW**

**1975**











# MILITARY CHAPLAINS'

## REVIEW

HUMAN POTENTIAL



SUMMER, 1975

## PREFACE

*The Military Chaplains' Review* is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to those articles having lasting value as reference material.

*The Military Chaplains' Review* is published quarterly. The opinions reflected in each article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Chief of Chaplains or the Department of the Army.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, doubled spaced, to the Editor, Military Chaplains' Review, United States Army Chaplain Board, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland 20755. Articles should be approximately 8 to 18 pages in length and, when appropriate, should be carefully footnoted.



## IN THIS ISSUE

The sixties witnessed profound changes in our society. Today people are groping toward another historical evolution. The traditions and attitudes of our country are questioned daily. Most of us are not clear on the nature of changes going on in our world, however, one perceptible change is the role of women today.

The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women in 1961 and the Report of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities in 1972 concluded that women are discriminated against in most aspects of life. The recent federal sex bias rules will have far reaching effects on our country's educational institutions. Newspaper accounts refer to the changes in athletic programs. The future will bring us more women doctors, teachers and technicians. Simply stated, our society is taking a significant step forward when intellect, talent and competence will be recognized in all endeavors regardless of the sex of the person involved.

The military community has changed by increasing the number of women that serve and in the number of young husbands and wives that are on active duty. Twenty-five percent of the young military women are married. As chaplains we must be prepared to serve their spiritual needs. These articles in the Military Chaplains' Review will assist us in understanding the changes that are taking place in our land and to be able to deal with some of these issues.

GERHARDT W. HYATT  
Chaplain (Major General), USA  
Chief of Chaplains



HEADQUARTERS  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
WASHINGTON,, DC, *Summer 1975*

**MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW**

Articles	Page
Journey Toward Freedom Dr. Letty M. Russell .....	1
"Sugar and Spice and Everything Nice": Stereotyping of Femininity The Reverend Gail Anderson Ricciuti.....	10
How It Looks from the Inside Lt. F. Diana Pohlman .....	20
The Heart of A Woman (Poem) Georgia Douglas Johnson.....	32
The Single Woman Sandy Daughton .....	33
The Modern Military Woman: A Profile Brigadier General Mildred C. Bailey .....	45
Forever Woman (Poem) Delle Cox .....	54
Turning the World Right Side Up Dr. Clare Benedicks Fischer .....	55
Guidelines for Equal Treatment of the Sexes A McGraw-Hill Book Company Report.....	65
Liberation, Not Separation Dr. C. Anne Davis .....	77
Suggested Readings and Resources .....	86



**LIBERATION IS A JOURNEY  
NOT A DESTINATION—**



# JOURNEY TOWARD FREEDOM

Letty M. Russell, Ph.D.

*Freedom is a journey* with others and for others toward God's future. Freedom cannot be defined. It can only be experienced as it breaks into our lives as new awareness of hope in God's future and confidence in the growing ability to experience and share love with others. Thus when we try to describe freedom in our lives as women in a world and a church in change we usually turn to the word, *liberation*. Not because we have been any more specific about what it means, but because liberation helps us to think of a process, a struggle with ourselves and others toward a more open future for humanity. The exact descriptions of that struggle varies for each woman, and for each human being.

This situation variability of liberation means that in every situation, every culture, every subculture the things from which we would be free, and the things for which we long are different. If some American middle-class women long to get out of the house and get a job, there are other women in the United States and in every continent who long to be free from grinding work at jobs, so they can be at home with their children!

*So how can we talk of women and freedom?* Not by definitions or blue prints, because there are none. Rather by sharing clues and stories of liberation which can help each of us to search out our own road, our own journey toward the future which God holds open for us. Or by sharing our common longing and speaking of the "hope that is in us" (I Peter 3:15). In the words of Billy Taylor's haunting jazz melody:

I wish I knew how it would feel to be free  
I wish I could break all these chains holding me  
I wish I could say all the things I should say,  
Say 'em loud, say 'em clear, for the whole world to hear!

Perhaps one way to begin is to return to another haunting description of the journey toward freedom which we find in Romans 8:15-27, and to look together at how *Groaning for Freedom*, *Discovery of Freedom*, and *Horizons of Freedom* appear to be happening in the experience of women in today's world.

*In Paul's description of the struggle toward liberation the first thing that strikes us is his vivid picture of the whole universe groaning for freedom.*

---

Adapted from *Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective—A Theology*, by Letty M. Russell. Copyright © 1974, Letty M. Russell. Used by permission of the Westminster Press. Dr. Russell is Professor of Theology at Yale University Divinity School.

In Romans 8:22 Paul tells us:

As we all know, up to the present time, the creation in all its parts groans with pain like the pain of childbirth. But not just creation alone groans, we ourselves, although we have tasted already the *apéritif* of the Spirit, we groan inwardly because we are still anticipating our adoption as children and the full liberation of our human existence.

What a relief! We discover that there is a solidarity of groaning. We are not the only ones who feel trapped and frustrated. Our sisters and brothers, even our environment, shares together in the oppressive structures of our society. All the universe longs for the fulfillment of God's new creation where all the parts will be born again in harmony; where the New Age promised by God and begun in Jesus Christ will be fulfilled. We also discover as Christians that we are not saved out of this groaning world, but as part of it. We are saved in hope because we have already tasted the first fruits of the Spirit of freedom (the *apéritif*). Our heightened restlessness and longing can only direct us toward participating in God's solidarity with human kind. It thrusts us to join with Christ who "emptied himself, taking the form of a servant", in order to be part of this journey with others and for others toward God's future (Philippians 2:7).

The women's liberation movement in the United States and other nations helps to underline this experience of solidarity in groaning. Through a steady flow of documents, papers, stories and actions women testify that they have discovered that male domination and the submission of women is a sign of personal and social groaning, brought about, not by God's design for creation, but by human disobedience and dislocation.

Certainly this experience of oppression is not quite the same as the classic forms of political and racial oppression because women tend to share the social status of their husbands. Where men have had access to the goods of life, women have not been bred to inferiority because they were destined to be the mothers of the next generation of sons. Yet the domination of women by men is an ancient and persistent form of the subjection of one human being to a permanent status of inferiority because of sex. Yet in this growing realization that they can participate more fully in shaping their own destiny and that of the world, women join in what Juergen Moltmann describes as the "Revolution of Freedom."<sup>1</sup> Their rising expectations, along with the many oppressed peoples of the world are leading them to participate

---

<sup>1</sup> *Religion, Revolution and the Future* (New York: Scribners, 1969) p. 77.



together with others in the struggle for humanization of our global society.

And it is no surprise that it is often white, middle-class women in the United States who are so vocal in the struggle for human liberation. They have, as it were, tasted initial kinds of freedom, and just because of this, they know that they are *not free*. In the very freedom from want which they experience has come a desire for more freedom . . . freedom to share with others in a better distribution of the goods of the earth . . . freedom to use their gifts to help to serve the needs of others.

Christian women are no exception to this experience. They know that they are called to service; to *diakonia*. But what form should this *diakonia* take? How can they use their new experience of groaning and longing to be free to work out better ways of expressing their solidarity with others? The service of Christ is a calling to be instruments of God's help, not a calling to be subservient. This in turn means that genuine service of others takes the form of solidarity in groaning and working with others to gain their freedom to shape their own future. Service which perpetuates dependence, we now know (from our own experience), is not service at all. It is a form of domination.

This is not new, but it now takes on urgency because of the hope in our own hearts, and because of the demands of others that they find out their own journey to freedom. *Diakonia* (service or ministry) has traditionally taken three forms: <sup>2</sup>

*Curative*: the healing of the wounds of those who have become victims of life. Providing help to the sick; the hungry, and homeless. *Preventive*: attempting to curtail developments which might easily lead curtailment of full freedom for life. Working through social action to provide vocational training centers, drug prevention programs, etc. *Prospective*: attempting to open the situation for a future of free realization in life. Helping those who are outcasts from the dominant culture, the outsiders, to participate fully in culture and in shaping their own liberation.

Until recently the church has specialized in curative or "band aid" tasks, and women have strongly supported these causes. Gradually we have realized that *diakonia* is genuine solidarity in groaning only when it moves toward preventive programs and finally into prospective advocacy of the rights of people to decide for themselves, how to work out their own political and social liberation. *Prospective diakonia* is what we would like ourselves. Many of us have discovered that the

---

<sup>2</sup> Hans Hoekendijk, *Horizons of Hope* (Nashville: Tidings, 1970) pp. 32-33.

basic necessities of life, without a way to help in shaping life, does not necessarily lead to liberation. The same discovery means that serving young people, or aged, or ghetto residents, or Third World People begins with *their participation* in setting the agenda, picking the battles so that we can be advocates in a solidarity of groaning and revolution of freedom.

*If we return to Paul's story of the journey toward freedom we notice a striking description of the discovery of freedom.*

*In Romans 8:18-19 he tells us:*

I consider that whatever we suffer now, cannot be compared at all with the splendour as yet not revealed, which is in store for us. The created universe is waiting on tiptoe for the children of God, to show what they are. In fact, the fondest dream of the universe is to catch a glimpse of real live children of God.

In his poetic image we find that everyone who is working and longing for freedom is eagerly longing (waiting on tiptoe) to catch a vision of what "it means to be free". For to be set free, is to become "real live children of God!" Because we are all in this journey together, we do not know exactly what children of God look like! Certainly if the members of the Christian church are presumed to represent them in any finished character there is little to be expected! Yet as Christians we have tasted the *apéritif* of the Spirit. We trust that in Jesus Christ God has made known the beginnings of the love and obedience and true humanity which is the destiny of a restored creation.

As we begin to share the life style of Jesus of Nazareth in giving our lives for others in *diakonia* and solidarity we discover the cost of freedom, and the struggle of obedience. We also catch a glimpse of what it would mean to be a whole human race in the words of Galatians 3:23-29 which speak of the barriers which Christ has already broken so that "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female." And because we are led by the Spirit of Christ we have hope that we may be able "to distinguish between the spirits" which lead toward new freedom (I Corinthians 12:10).

Again it may be the "ferment of freedom" in the women's liberation movement and in other liberation movements which puts this question before us with new urgency: What does it mean to be human? Too long the image of what it means to be human has been patterned after the image of the white, western, male so that all other people (non-white, non-western, and women) appear as only partly human because they don't measure up to this mythical norm. Women have come to recognize sexism for what it is. A false ideology which declares that

people are inferior because of their sex. Just as the non-white majority of the world has come to recognize racism as a cancerous ideology which declares that people are inferior because of the color of their skin.

Eliminating sexism and racism, therefore, means the restructuring of our whole society, not just saying "it isn't so." It involves politics, economics, education, business and family life styles. Such a struggle begins with us, in our own hearts where we have to learn first to be *pro-woman*, so that we can become *pro-human*. But it must stretch around the world to all humanists (men, women and children) who are looking for the freedom to shape their own futures and participate in the search for what it means to be children of God.

As women in the church we are called to share in this critical process of discerning what it means to be human and trying to live out our discoveries of freedom. Paul tells us in I Corinthians 12:10 that the ability to discern the signs of the time and to be thus able to work toward freedom is a gift of the Holy Spirit. The word he uses for discernment is *diakrisis*.<sup>3</sup> This function of *diakrisis* can help women and the church to take a prophetic stance over against society as they seek to discern God's actions and to criticize those parts of the world (including themselves) which deny God's plan and purpose of justice, freedom and peace for humanity. In this way we can join others in helping to shape society and discovering new freedom, rather than being shaped by society and old cultural assumptions which close off the future.

This diakritical role is difficult especially for women. To begin with it means having courage to be a misfit in society, acting and thinking according to a solidarity with those who are groaning and "disturbing the status-quo". The cost of this may mean that we become "marginal women" those who don't fit with our peers or into accepted norms. Secondly, Christian responsibility in the political and in all sectors of society calls for both theological discernment and technical know how. This means we will have to do our homework and be willing to take concrete actions for social change based on our own new consciousness of the social and theological issues at stake.

Raising our own consciousness is not enough. We must learn to act together with others to transform the societies in which we live by all the means necessary: constantly asking God through the power of the Spirit to, in the words of Julius Lester, not only to raise our consciousness, but to *raze our consciousness*, so that our hearts are restless to work for the revealing of what real live children of God might look like.

---

<sup>3</sup> Letty M. Russell, "Rapidation in the Church," *Risk* V:3/4 (1969) pp. 58-67.

*Finally if we return again to Paul's description of the journey toward freedom we become aware that we live constantly in the horizon of freedom.*

*In Romans 8:20 he says:*

The creation is in the grip of frustration and futility. Not by its own choice; God made it so, and therefore there is always hope that one day the universe will be set free from the shackles of mortality and decadence and share the glorious freedom of the children of God.

The horizon of freedom is hope. Hope that God's promised future will become a reality. This "hope is not the opium of the people, but an impulse to change the world in the perspective of God's promises."<sup>4</sup> The nature of an horizon is that it always disappears and a new one appears as we move toward it. The horizon of freedom constantly changes and looks different as we journey with others and for others toward God's future. Because of the problems and difficulties and plain "mess" of the world we live in, there appears to be "no hope". The horizon closes in and there is no vision. Often our best planning and efforts bring little change in the immense problems of our world, and the great problems of our own lives. Yet the future which we plan is not the last word, there is always the horizon of the future which comes toward us as God's future. When we act now as if that anticipated future of God is breaking into our lives, we discover new horizons of freedom.<sup>5</sup> God is hoping for us, and it is up to us to live as if God's freedom were already present in our lives (I Corinthians 7:25-31).

The women's liberation movement can help us to move toward new horizons of freedom by teaching us some of the fundamental facts of liberation. The first fact is that no one is free until all are free. This means that the horizon changes, but does not disappear because a few privileged people gain new privileges. Sisterhood is a constant reminder of our responsibility for others. Whatever gains we have made, they are only partial unless society is structured so that other women have equal access to these changes, be they economic, political, social or private. Those who have made it, however they have made it, have the responsibility to share the task of building new life styles with all women and men and not just for themselves.

The second is that women's liberation is not the cause of disruption in our societies. It is a result of the changes in technology and family

---

<sup>4</sup> Ferdinand Kerstiens, "Hope," *Sacramentum Mundi* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969) III, p. 65.

<sup>5</sup> Ernst Kasemann, *Jesus Means Freedom* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970) p. 73.

patterns which are causing women to be free from traditional biological roles of child raising and maintenance of household. Many women are seeking new patterns of family life as partnership and new life styles in society because they have the courage to see that the old patterns are not working well for men or women and they are willing to risk working for a more humane way of life.

The last is that liberation is not a passing fad. It will not disappear even when the media ignore it, or is no longer fashionable for speeches. As long as people are oppressed there will be a “groaning for freedom” whether in acts of rebellion, or in actions to build a new future of justice for all. And we are called to keep the “rumor going”. The world can be different. God intends it to be so and we can begin by acting out that intention here and now.

For women in the church, freedom began long ago and it is time to act now as if we are free. We are called according to Paul, to live now in the horizon of the new age. The word he uses for this in I Corinthians 7:23-31 is *hos me* — to live as if not — to live as if the facts of the situation are not the end of the matter, because a new world is breaking in on us. We can begin now by living in anticipation of God’s future. The Greek word for this is *prolepsis*. *Prolepsis* is an anticipation of a hoped for future in the present. Proleptic actions anticipate the situation for which they work by living as if the situation, at least in part, has already arrived. The dictionary definition of *prolepsis* is that of a “chronological mistake”, or the dating of an event before it actually happened. It is the opposite of anachronism, which is a chronological mistake which dates an event after it actually happened. For a long time the church has often appeared anachronistic. Today we and the church are called to be a chronological mistake — but not a backward mistake — a mistake which is proleptic because it establishes signs of hope, horizons of the future, in the midst of the present.

As members of the church we are called to be a sign of the kingdom of God; a “lived out” Beatitude of the future of humanity. We can become signs in small or large ways by contradicting injustice, promoting peace, standing in solidarity with the poor. By living out new life styles of partnership with men in home, society and church, we can become proleptic signs. By working in critical and concrete ways along with those who are oppressed in other nations as well as our own, we can begin to build world solidarity now. Women are free, and they can act freely and responsibly together for others now.

I have been trying to describe for you what it means to journey on the road toward freedom with others, for others toward God’s future. The clues I have given are few, because ultimately each woman must

liberate herself. But I would suggest that these clues might help in the search:

—That the universal *groaning for freedom* calls us toward suffering and service (*diakonia*) with others.

—That the *discovery of freedom* means a continuing and *diakritical* search for how to be human beings, real live children of God.

—That the *horizon of freedom* leads us to hope against hope in God's promise, and to add our own limited efforts to the business of *prolepsis*: bringing the future into the present.

I trust that women and freedom belong together. Perhaps simply, as Zechariah puts it, because I am "a prisoner of hope" (9:12). I cannot escape the facts of my situation, yet I trust in the reality of my freedom as a gift of God. God cares for us. God is a humanist, so we "*can know* how it feels to be free."

We are already on the road toward freedom; caught up in the process of liberation. But there are many roads, and I cannot give you or myself a map. All I can say is that there is a solidarity of groaning for freedom among all our sisters and brothers of the world who find themselves oppressed, and invite you who would be free to join in the very universal symphony of groaning, so that we can all play our part.

**AND ALONG THE WAY  
THERE ARE QUESTIONS**

## **“SUGAR AND SPICE AND EVERYTHING NICE”: THE STEREOTYPING OF FEMININITY**

The Rev. Gail Anderson Ricciuti

They are with all of us—the secure assumptions that define our self-image, the pre-packaged definitions concerning the meaning of womanhood and manliness. They cling to us from the moment of birth, the day some of us emerge from the hospital wrapped in pink blankets and others in blue; they follow us through every act of living — every thought, every breath — until the day we die. But some of us, particularly among the ranks of women, are no longer content to be bound by role definitions originating in antiquity. With the re-emergence of feminism and the resulting women's movement worldwide, the winds have turned.

As we begin to re-orient ourselves to the world, to reject definitions which are no longer applicable, and to learn to value ourselves as women rather than continue to engage in the self-contempt that has become ingrained in our sex, we also begin to re-evaluate that elusive quality “femininity”: and questions emerge — hard questions — whose answers are critical to our selfhood. What does it mean to be a “feminine” person? What are the implications of feminism? Perhaps most crucial of all, must femininity and the feminist lifestyle be mutually exclusive? Or is it possible to be whole and liberated women without rejecting what is truly feminine about our natures? These questions begin in earnest, perhaps, when a Christian counsellor (male) assures us that our very, God-given nature is such that every woman on earth can find absolute fulfillment exclusively in keeping house and caring for children; and any deviation from that standard indicates a weakness of character or spirituality. Or perhaps our questioning is intensified when a male colleague sneers that our femininity contradicts our feminist views. Having experienced these and similar situations personally, along with untold other women, I am convinced that the difficult questions about “feminine” and “masculine” behavior must be confronted seriously: particularly by those of us in the Church who are in positions to affect profoundly the attitudes and self-images of both women and men.

What exactly is “femininity” — or, rather, what has society traditionally assumed it to be? Most dictionaries do not prove helpful, to say the least, in finding *positive* images of the feminine nature. The highly-respected *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* seems at first glance to define “feminine” and “femininity” in a most

---

Gail Anderson Ricciutti, a 1973 graduate of Princeton Theological Seminary, is an ordained minister of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.



superficial sense, until one realizes that this sort of observation has always marked our culture's attitude toward women. Illustrating the usage of the words, the volume lists characteristics associated with women as "frilly feminine fashions," "receiving or enduring action: PASSIVE," "charming" (as opposed to "sloppy"), "delicate femininity," and "catty femininity." The definitions are startlingly true to the stereotyped "feminine" woman: soft, frilly, gentle, weak, childlike, unstable, and evaluated primarily by her attractiveness to men. Theodore Reik neatly summed up the picture with the generalization that women want to be loved for their looks and charm, and men for what they accomplish! The disconcerting fact is that these misconceptions of "femininity" often appear to be accurate: the description *fits* so many women, as the reasoning goes, that it must be true. On the contrary, as we will see, the characteristics which have for so long been described as "feminine" are basically acquired or culturally conditioned, rather than inherent. We are products of our socialization; and many of us wish to sabotage this faulty mannequin-ideal, in the fervent hope that one day our daughters will be spared the insidiousness of that process.

The programming of women to fit such criteria for femininity has resulted very neatly in our unequal status with men in American society. The causes reach back many centuries, of course: but the results are easily recognizable today. Even the origin of the English word "woman" indicated a secondary role in life, the earliest Anglo-Saxon term being "wifman," or "wife of the man." That the Equal Rights Amendment guaranteeing equal freedoms for women had to be written at all in the twentieth century — and that many states have yet to ratify it while others are rejecting it or reconsidering their initial approval — proves that we have not in reality made much progress in our attitudes since medieval times.

## THE HISTORY OF FEMINISM

Realizing that the female subservience which is still the norm in most of contemporary culture has its roots in our concepts of "femininity," an increasing number of women (and more recently, men as well) are allying themselves with the ideals of the feminist movement. Feminism is not a new ideology in history: in all times and places there have been women with the courage to stand against masculine domination and to live against the stream of popular opinion within their society. History (more often than not the unwritten history not recorded in textbooks) has been filled with women who devoted themselves individually to the struggle for self-determination. The earliest organized women's rights movement in

America, however, had its origins in the abolitionism of the 1830s, when women found themselves excluded from the anti-slavery societies formed by men. Consequently, they initiated their own abolitionist societies — in New England, New York, and Philadelphia — and began to gain expertise in organizing and public speaking, a privilege always denied them previously by appeal to the admonitions of St. Paul against women speaking in church (*q.v.* I Cor. 14:34-35; I Tim. 2:11-12). It was a formidable advance which naturally created much hostility toward them, both by virtue of the controversial nature of the abolitionist movement and the “presumption” of women who would actually speak out on the subject in public. The opposition to their efforts heightened a growing awareness among these women of their own position as slaves; and thus was born the Women’s Liberation Movement, as it is called today. The movement had its official beginning in 1848 at a convention called by abolitionists Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton in Seneca Falls, New York, expressly for the purpose of dealing with the emerging issues of women.

It is significant that the mystique of the “Southern Belle” — the worshipful elevating to a pedestal of Southern white womanhood — arose in society, with corresponding echoes in the sentimental plantation novels, in the mid-1800s, simultaneously with the beginnings of feminism and the growth of abolitionism in the North. One cannot help but feel that the elaborate chivalry shown to women in that era spring at least in part from a sense of distrust: excessive politeness is a subtle but effective way of keeping another person at arm’s length. As noted anthropologist Ashley Montague pointed out,<sup>1</sup> although the forms of chivalry continue to be valued by many women, they were not originally intended as signs of friendship but rather as patronizing ways of reminding women that they were expected to remain submissive and dependent upon their chivalrous protectors.

The years following World War I saw increasing gains for women in America, as they gained enfranchisement and branched out into the labor market. Then came the Third Reich in Germany, and Hitler’s attempt to reverse the feminist trend in his empire by emphasizing that women’s *proper* interests for the good of the country were “Kinder, Kuche, und Kirche”: children, kitchen, and church. Now, thirty years later in a nation that most vociferously rejected the Fuhrer’s other ideals, the message still conveyed to women is that the *feminine* woman’s most honorable pursuits are children and kitchen — if not the Church. And so the re-emerging feminism of the late ’60s and the ’70s seeks to expand women’s options, both for self-fulfillment and

---

<sup>1</sup> In *The Natural Superiority of Women*, 3rd ed. (1953; rpt. New York: Collier Books, 1968).

for self-expression. Chief among these efforts is the redefinition of what is "feminine":

Men insist that they don't mind women succeeding so long as they retain their "femininity." Yet the qualities that men consider "feminine" — timidity, submissiveness, obedience, silliness, and self-debasement — are the very qualities best guaranteed to assure the defeat of even the most gifted aspirant . . . To the "masculists" of both sexes, "femininity" implies all that *men* have built into the female image in the past few centuries: weakness, imbecility, dependence, masochism, unreliability, and a certain "babydoll" sexuality that is actually only a projection of male dreams. To the "feminist" of both sexes, femininity is synonymous with the external female principle, noting strength, integrity, wisdom, justice, dependability, and a psychic power . . .<sup>2</sup>

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF "FEMININITY" IN THE INDIVIDUAL

The traits that are adopted by women in the form of "feminine wiles" (such as "Never let yourself appear smarter than the man") begin to be picked up by the girl-child at a very tender age. She learns consciously or subconsciously through nearly every stimulus she receives that certain behaviors are both expected of her in life and useful for self-preservation. Success in the long-term goals which are also part of her hidden learning process depends upon them. The earlier she learns to conform to these standards, the better will be her chances of "making it" as date-bait later on. Consequently, sex stereotyping — the most insidious and destructive form of socialization — begins at birth; and little girls receive very different messages from those conveyed to little boys, throughout childhood and puberty. Unlike those experienced by boys, the spoken and unspoken signals received by girls are, more often than not, contradictory. We are expected to "look nice," but as we mature we are scolded or teased for endless primping before the bathroom mirror. We are expected to "act like ladies" — and then humiliated for our awkwardness or incompetence in physical education and sports. We are expected to be good and to do well in school; but those of us who succeed find that our good behavior and our excelling are either taken for granted or placed at a much lower premium than the same behavior from boys. Those of us who, by reason of lesser ability or inclination, do *not* succeed, find that we are much more severely penalized than boys, who are allowed a rebellion or period of experimentation now and then as a matter of course and who, after all, "*will* be boys." The behavior that would cause no more than minor irritation to parents, coming from a son, causes shame when acted out by a daughter. Young girls are usually sheltered and

---

<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth Gould Davis, *The First Sex* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971) pp. 333-34.

over-protected by both parents, and thus limited in their contacts with the world from earliest childhood, while boys are not. Implicit in all these limitations is the message that girls are somehow more frail, less responsible and less capable of facing life, less trustworthy, and probably a little evil as well. Add to these the supposition that "feminine" persons are (and are expected to be) frilly, trivial, and not very bright; and the conflicts begin to be more than evident. All this is a heavy burden under which to grow up, if one happens to be a girl.

"Sugar and spice and everything nice/ That's what little girls are made of./ Snips and snails and puppy-dog tails/ That's what little boys are made of." As the old familiar nursery rhyme suggests, the "double standard" has never been merely a sexual one. It should come as no surprise that a lesser freedom in all aspects of life has a deleterious effect on the female personality, with the result that the exaggerated stereotypes of "feminine" behavior actually do ring true in many women. Barbara Grizzuti Harrison points out that as a consequence of this early programming, many grown women — perhaps even *most* of us, at one time or another — suffer from "virulent forms of guilt . . . a sense of having sinned, a feeling, unattached to a specific cause, of being capable of an unknown, but terrible, offense."<sup>3</sup>

Our educational system on the whole bears more responsibility in this end result than does the family. Studies show that, intellectually, girls on the preschool-elementary level function in almost all areas generally superior to boys. This achievement level of females rises steadily up to high school at which point it suffers a sharp down-turn; while the achievement of males continues to rise, climaxing in college and graduate school. Clearly, given the contemporary biological and psychological data which erases any doubt about the intellectual potential of women, this sharp divergence in upper-level achievement must be attributed to a change in a young woman's expectations of herself and of the level she is capable of attaining. One may rightly assume that this lowering of self-image springs from differences between the ways children of each sex are taught to perceive themselves. Dr. Matina Horner, president of Radcliffe College, developed a theory several years ago from her experience at Harvard that women fail because they are afraid of success. Her ideas are still under debate; but there must be some truth in her observation, when we consider the statistics showing bright young female students either failing outright in their studies or achieving far below their potential.

From what sources does this deep-seated fear of succeeding arise? Perhaps it is an issue of "feminine" versus "masculine" behavior, since for a woman to succeed in this society requires most often the rejection

---

<sup>3</sup> *Unlearning the Lie: Sexism in School* (New York: Liveright Books, 1973) p. 37.

of what society has decided are "feminine" qualities, and opting for what have been designated "masculine" behavior patterns. This can be an extremely frightening prospect for a woman who has been through years of subtle but complete indoctrination into what are socially-acceptable ways for her to act. "Indoctrination" is not, I think, an exaggeration: reams are being written on the sex stereotyping rampant in children's books and text books alone, books which by and large make it clear that when girls develop physical and intellectual confidence, strength, and assertiveness, they suffer a corresponding loss of "femininity." Obviously, the stereotypes are just as damaging to young boys as they are to girls. A stoic, *macho* image is projected onto males by the same cultural sources that define femininity; and a boy who deviates from the norm is labelled by his peers as a "sissy," while a young adult male who does not conform is quickly suspected of being "gay." It cannot be over emphasized that the liberation of women is going to result in human emancipation which will affect the male as well.

One finds the same type of imagery concerning "masculine" and "feminine" in supposedly good-quality children's television programs, such as Sesame Street; not to mention the endless, tasteless barage of Saturday morning cartoon shows punctuated with toy commercials showing, again and again, the boys active and alert and inquisitive, with the admiring girls on the sidelines cheering them on. The toy industry is a prime offender in inflicting faulty stereotypes upon children through seemingly-innocent playthings. Specifically for girls, there are toys like the "Suzy Homemaker Oven" with its "happy-little-housewife" ideal; and the ever-popular Barbie Doll, who recently celebrated her "Sweet 16" birthday with a whole new accompanying line of play cosmetics, hairpieces, party dresses, and her very own Elevator Townhouse. Parker Brothers cashes in on this "femininity sells" angle, with a full complement of trivia games: the Emily Post Popularity Game; the "authorized" Miss America Pageant Game (in which the girls compete in personality, talent, swimsuit, and evening gown); and the What Shall I Wear? game in which each girl races to complete *her* wardrobe before the others. No further mention need be made of the shoddy values implicit in these toys, aside from the sexist conditioning! Even in the packaging of toys, before they ever come off the store shelves, the message is clear. Most often, a boy is shown operating the equipment, putting the set together, winning the game; the girl is either watching in admiration, or looking puzzled or discouraged. The popular occupations puzzles often used in preschools and kindergartens are almost laughable in the extremely limited dreams they offer little girls. In one such game, out of 24 choices regarding what the children may wish to be when they grow

up, little boys may pick from 21 — from brick mason to sailor to doctor. Two similar games on the market add pitifully few extra options: among them, mother, ballerina, and waitress. The message about femininity is again clear. Except for nursing and teaching, female professions outside the home are the artsy frills in life, entertaining (as of course women are expected to be) but not necessarily essential. There are a few signs of hope in the toy industry — including a new Lionel campaign advertising toy trains for both sexes, and a wider range of non-stereotyped dolls for boys — but there is still much needed reform.<sup>4</sup>

All these childhood stimuli, then, from home to school to television to toys, determine and mold the life goals of girls toward one climax, symbolized by another brainchild of the media: the annual Miss America Pageant. What young girl has not been taught to dream of being the shapeliest, the most glamorous, the most popular, the “fairest of the fair” (to quote the pageant’s theme song), and little else? Here and there, women are organizing to protest this type of “stock show” evaluation of femininity, as did the first group in 1970, speaking out against that all-American image “that oppresses women in every area in which it purports to represent us.”<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, the beauty contest phenomenon of what I shall call “femininity as physique” still sets the tone for what is “feminine” in our culture. It should be obvious the violence this phenomenon has done to the black woman, as well as to whites. I cannot presume to speak knowledgeably here about the oppression of black or other non-Caucasian women in this country, since each labors under a different degree of prejudice determined by *three* evils together: not only sexism, but also racism and class consciousness. But the non-white woman is even more tragically oppressed by white males’ definitions of “femininity” than the rest of us; and she must not be required to become a physical emulation of white womanliness (as she so often has in the past), any more than the white woman should be required to measure up to the false standard of “Miss America” femininity.

What is left for women who have passed the age limit for Miss America and have *not* measured up? In experiments conducted with adolescent girls who are asked to write their autobiography as if they were elderly women looking back, a distressing pattern emerges. Often the girls create romantic life “scripts” for their imagined

---

<sup>4</sup> For further analysis of toys on the market today, see “Toys for Free Children,” *Ms.* magazine, December 1973, pp. 48ff., and “Gifts for Free Children,” *Ms.* magazine, December 1974, pp. 63ff., both by Letty Cottin Pogrebin.

<sup>5</sup> No More Miss America! Ten Points of Protest,” *Sisterhood is Powerful*, ed. Robin Morgan, Vintage Books edition (New York: Random House, 1970) p. 521.

experiences through college years, travel, wedding day, and childbirth (including elaborate descriptions of their husbands and houses): but between the birth of their last child and their death, virtually nothing happens. There is an eerie, silent gap in these imaginary life stories, as if the girls have no goals or visions for what they possibly might do or become in life after the "Miss America" years are past. The silence is tragic; but it reflects society's dictates through a definition of "femininity" that excludes maturity, age, experience, and wisdom.

Once past the glamour queen years, the American woman comes down from her pedestal and becomes an object of contempt for much of the media, institutions controlled by the very persons (still almost exclusively males) who created the image to which she learned to conform in the first place. It has been observed by many <sup>6</sup> that although magazine publishers, cartoonists, and television script writers are bound by ethical codes requiring their respectful treatment of the mentally retarded and the handicapped, nevertheless they seem at liberty to portray the American woman however they choose: as stupid, selfish, scatter-brained, unreliable, and ridiculous; as domineering mothers-in-law, and spendthrifts unable to do simple arithmetic in checkbooks; as vapid blondes, overbearing matrons, and gossip-mongers. Any one evening spent viewing television commercials will confirm these observations. At any rate, this points up the fact that mature, adult women continue to be oppressed by the same conflicts which I have noted with regard to little girls. Society sets up standards of "femininity" and then criticizes women for possessing the self-same qualities. The standard, for instance, that truly "feminine" women should be childlike is followed by the criticism that women are impulsive and overemotional! We are told that it is our nature to be delicate and pretty — but criticized for seeming weak and nervous. The more "feminine" the woman attempts to become under these stereotypes, the more she opens herself to degradation. One wonders that there are not more mental and emotional breakdowns among women, who continue to function in society in the midst of such contradictions!

It is at this point that the oft-cited issue of biological destiny arises. Are not the so-called "female traits" determined by biology? It has been only in relatively recent times that this theory has been disproven by research into ways of isolated peoples. The great definitive work on the issue is Margaret Mead's *Sex and Temperament*,<sup>7</sup> reporting her investigation of three primitive tribes of New Guinea in terms of male/female roles within their particular social structures. She

---

<sup>6</sup> Including the late Elizabeth Gould Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 324f.

<sup>7</sup> (1935; rpt. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1963).

found that biology is *not* destiny; rather, the dictates of one's own society determine behavior. Among the Mundugumor, aggressiveness and hostility is the assumed norm for women as well as men; but the Arapesh train males to be gentle and nurturing, while the females take on characteristics we have so long assumed to be naturally "masculine." The Manus, Mead discovered, turn over to men the task of rearing children beginning a year after birth, believing that they are best suited for child-rearing. Other studies since Mead's in New Guinea have uncovered similar data about peoples in far-flung parts of the globe, such as the Navaho and Iroquois tribes in which both men and women are assumed to be equally suited to share all facets of private and community life. The import of these studies is that such qualities as passivity or responsiveness can no longer be viewed as normative, sex-linked behavior for either women or men.

The recognition of these things, which has been the very impetus for the contemporary feminist movement, signals a new day for the realization of human potential and human fulfillment; but the daybreak is barely upon us yet. Even in the recent past, the stereotypes have held and *new* ones have been applied, to include feminism itself. Thus, a woman who claimed to be a feminist but who did not seek to make herself rough, hard, brassy — "masculine," in the traditional sense — was assumed to be a liar. One who did not seek to think and behave as a man was believed by the rest of society to betray feminism. By that logic we as women often moved unwittingly full-circle, measuring ourselves once more by the old standard that anything "masculine" is valuable, and anything "feminine" is not. It will be essential to the future of our society to understand that feminist tenets are not in favor of aggressiveness, strength, and self-assurance to the *exclusion* of the gentle, the nurturing, the creative; but rather against the limiting of human potential by an arbitrary stereotyping of "masculine" and "feminine" roles. True feminism is not an attempt to make women into little carbon copies of men. Perhaps when these things are fully understood, when this stance is finally embraced by society as a whole, men and boys will no longer be judged virile or not merely on the basis of their brawniness, competitiveness, or failure to display emotion. The possibilities for masculine behavior will include a new dimension of freedom for the male spirit.

The options for women will be even more staggering: women who may be emotionally restrained, energetic, strong, and/or self-confident will no longer be automatically tagged "lesbians." Women who are free to display deep emotion, vitality, imagination, and/or compassion will no longer be labelled "unstable" or "presumptuous" or "dizzy blondes." Rather, what is important in each person will be that she be true to her own personhood, her own sense



of self. The time will not arrive, however, without terrible cost: becoming aware of oneself as a liberated human being requires courage, psychological energy, patience, and strength. Overcoming years of subtle, often-unconscious stereotyping is neither a quick nor by any means an easy process, particularly when every aspect of one's life is at stake. To accomplish this re-birth of self and society, women will increasingly be needing, and claiming for themselves, space and opportunity — psychological as well as physical — with a new militance. But our goal, when it has been reached, will mean the redefinition of what is "feminine": not as a set of characteristics, but as a state of being. Selfhood is the issue. The "feminine" woman will one day emerge as the one who is able to be most wholly herself . . . the one who is becoming the most fully alive, the most fully human. To serve this end is, after all is said and done, the calling of the Christian minister. Feminism is the quest for human liberation. It has a *great deal* to do with the message of the Gospel and the mission of the Church in our day.

## HOW IT LOOKS FROM THE INSIDE: An Ordained Woman Looks at Military Chaplaincy

Chaplain Florence Dianna Pohlman, LT, USNR

Pioneering ventures are often difficult and may only be fully evaluated when they become part of past history. Defeats and discouragement along the path not only cloud the goal but unsettle all travelers who dare leave the comforts of the familiar. This article is an on-the-trail report, not full of glowing conclusions but an honest and realistic report of the trail ahead of us all.

The new adventure of course is in a woman serving as minister within the military. By so doing she participates in two human institutions among those most oppressive to women: the Church and the Navy. The Judeo-Christian heritage has a many-thousand year history of relegating the female to a position lower than that of the male. Spirituality and godliness have been in terms of the male, and the realm of flesh and sinfulness are identified with the female.<sup>1</sup>

While religion has served to develop and explain the sexism within which we live, the Navy from its beginning drew its identity from the masculine as over against the feminine. From early tribal times men have taken the role of provider, protector and defender. All of these roles were combined in maritime activities and the additional separation afforded by "going to sea" engendered a fraternal, masculinizing effect on the group of shipmates. All contact and influence was cut off with the females. Adventure and separation were two of the great joys of the sea. It should therefore be no surprise that hard core seamen have so strongly resisted the intrusion of women into their maritime fraternity in recent history.

Change is overtaking us all, however, and sometimes the law, as it reflects the growing urge for liberation in many camps, outstrips our reluctant attitudes. And so in August of 1972 Z-Gram 116 called for

---

<sup>1</sup> Rosemary Reuther, *Liberation Theology*, Chapter 7: "Is Christianity Misogynist?", Paulist Press, 1972.

---

Florence Dianna Pohlman is a native of San Diego, graduated from Occidental College in Los Angeles with a BA in Music, did graduate studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in French Horn and Curriculum Development and earned her Master of Divinity from Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. On 1 July 1973 she was commissioned in the U.S. Navy and became the first woman to serve as Chaplain in any of the country's Armed Forces. Chaplain Pohlman is stationed at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, working with the Recruit Training Command and also as Chaplain assigned to the Navy Orlando Alcohol Rehabilitation Drydock (ARD); Her husband, Donald L. Bell, is also a United Presbyterian minister and works as a civilian on the same base as the Director of the ARD. They have a twelve year old daughter.

women professionals to serve in all Navy Staff Corps and the way was cleared for my application. Here was an historical moment when the situation and the person met at a ripe time. The processing was accomplished in short order and I looked forward in anticipation to a difficult and challenging task.<sup>2</sup>

## IDENTITY CRISIS

The first issue to demand my attention began long before I signed the papers and continues in my perspective to be the central question for the military chaplain: how does one serve both God and the state's militia? The question was first pressed by my colleagues and mentors in the church, many of whom were in various stages of reaction against the long and seemingly futile war in Indo-China. Christian ministry, I contended, always has its own integrity regardless of the persons and situations forming its context; God deals with people whoever and wherever they are. To my great sadness, I have so far not found this to be a live issue anywhere in the Chaplain's Corps. The matter is not only one of integrity but more pointedly one of authority. Can one serve God and state *equally*? Which one takes precedent? Of course there is a great deal of lip service given the issue, but its significance does not permit a mere superficial treatment.

How does each authority lay claim on the military chaplain? The church prepares one for ministry and confirms the endorsement. From that point on ownership is in the military's hand: salary is paid by the state (control), evaluations are written by the chain of command (accountability), and promotions are dependent on fitness report evaluations (motivation). The church may at any time remove endorsement (and, thus, the person from the job) but in everyday matters and career planning, the chaplain is directly under the authority of the Department of Defense. It is, therefore, easy to slip into a more serious obedience to the agency which feeds the mouth and opens the door to future success, while giving only superficial allegiance to the spiritual endorsing agent, the Church. In reality, then, God loses his final authority over the clergy who serve the militia. It is not the first time such a conflict of interest has occurred, and chaplains would do well to read "The Theological Declaration of Barmen" (1934) to discover how the German Confessional Church met the test.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> I recently learned that one woman's application for the same job received two years earlier, was accepted one week after my commissioning. Her liability was black skin. Unfortunately not even all women are equal.

<sup>3</sup> See Author C. Cochran, *The Church's Confession Under Hitler*, Westminster Press, 1962, pp. 237-242.

Is this a legitimate issue for a woman to raise? Yes. It is an issue of identity. Who am I, as a person, as a woman, a minister, in relationship to myself, to others, to God? If we are dishonest in any part, we run the risk of becoming deceptive in all that we are and do.

## EMERGING FROM THE CHRYSALIS

Who then is a woman? All of us, regardless of age, sex, religion, race and background, have been deeply conditioned by the classical stereotyping of roles for women. Most acceptable are the female roles of daughter, mother, wife, sister, secretary, and sex object. Females themselves — often not realizing the extent of their self-imposed imprisonment — act out their acceptance of the above roles by cultivating to excess their physical attractiveness and social dependency. The woman who struggles to be free from the old patterns finds herself constantly shoved back into the old mold by those around her. She is caught in the dual struggle of fulfilling her own personhood (uncharted terrain) and also dealing with the strong negative reaction of others (hostile territory). In such a struggle, where basic survival plays a dominant role, this new woman can in no way be equated with either the old woman stereotype or in terms of the new profession in which she functions. She is not simply “another chaplain.” What she *is* cannot be handed to her, but can only be discovered in the future through her collective experimental struggle. The new and unknown future is not a struggle for her alone, however. The man’s role also becomes threatened and his own identity comes up for question.

Two reactions seemed to prevail at the Navy Chaplains’ School as the Corps prepared for the advent of women. The prevalent attitude was that women should minister to women. Presumably this would prevent the myriad problems thought to accompany women working with men; it would also give a cause for having women chaplains at all; and additionally it would provide the least threat to the male chaplains as they saw their function. The minority reaction among the men was that women should “be like any other chaplain” and minister to males and females alike. The latter was adopted in my case. It seemed the fairest of the two options. At least it did until I realized the whole plan had been predetermined and handed to me. I had no part in the considerations. One year into the job, I discovered a great need among the women line personnel — enlisted and officer — with whom I work. (Orlando is the only Navy Recruit Training Command to train women as well as men. The staff as well as recruits includes a number of women.) They needed someone to help them reflect on their own identity and function as women in this masculine organization. When I

voiced this need to the chaplains and stated my intention to pursue it, I was met with an interesting variety of responses. "Do you think you have some special ability to minister to women that we don't have?" "Don't limit yourself and the women after you to this narrow ministry." "Let us counsel some of the female recruits, too." *Et cetera*. There was also a certain undercurrent of satisfaction: "She can take the women, the men with 'real' problems we'll handle." Honesty at this point would lead us chaplains to wonder if we might have a deep identity crisis—who we are as women and men and what is our task as ministers.

## WOMAN AS NAVY DEPENDENT

Our parish is unique and specialized. I view it quite naturally with a woman's eyes and I understand it best through the woman's experience of it. (This approach, while seemingly specialized, will be found to have a wide interpretive application for the chaplain in the entire area of ministry.) The oldest role women have had in relationship to the Navy is that of wife. Her job is to tend the home fires, raise the children, and manage with or without the husband's presence. While identity and security are lodged in him, her lifestyle accommodates two modes: submissiveness when he is home and self-sufficiency when he is at sea. Coupled with the schizophrenic personality developed by this dual existence is the experience of being a "fifth class citizen," as one widow termed it. She explained that the dependent wife is last in the hierarchy of decision making. The sailor himself receives orders, the family comes under his control, and she is merely a pensioner. Only children remain lower in the hierarchy.

Several options become available to her for dealing with the frustrations which build up within her. Constructive solutions are available in which she can transmute her anger. She may develop hobbies and other interests, or share common experiences with other wives. The latter is particularly effective among airdale wives who more imminently face the death of their husbands. One such widow told me that where the chaplain could have been most helpful in preparing families for such a tragedy they did not, and the greater support system was provided by other wives. Both of the widows cited above have learned a painful lesson: the chaplain's primary commitment is to the military member. If a marital problem arises, the counseling chaplain will most likely side with the sailor; if death threatens, he <sup>4</sup> is more frequently concerned for the military member

---

<sup>4</sup> The masculine pronoun is consciously used here. As a rule I avoid the use of masculine terms as all-inclusive. They are not.

than for the anxious or grieving dependents. In many ways she is an extremely powerless and unconsidered member of our society.

There are, of course, destructive options for the dependent wife to choose in handling her frustration and powerlessness. She may throw her anger outward and aim it at the children. Or she may direct the anger into herself. Depression is the primary result of such inward-directed anger. It may be manifested in quiet passivity or in visible destruction. A most frequent avenue of active self-destruction is substance abuse: the excessive intake of food, chemical drugs (primarily amphetamines and barbiturates), or alcohol. While one study has indicated that approximately 38% of Navy personnel are problem drinkers, to my knowledge no attempt has been made to determine the number of Navy dependents who have a similar problem. The problem-drinking worker can more easily be detected when job performance drops, however the alcohol-abusing housewife can be hidden easily in the privacy of the home or in the whirl of social groups. There is reason to believe that there is a high incidence of alcoholism among military wives, higher than among their civilian counterparts. It is not to be assumed, however, that this is indicative of moral degeneration, as many church people (lay and clergy) have been led to believe. Alcoholism is a disease and it is treatable. However, the wife, who has such an illness finds treatment to be remote, for not only is she easily hidden, but her ability to make any types of decision for her own benefit has been eroded by her lifestyle of submission and powerlessness. Every problem drinker must finally face a confrontation to begin recovery; once there, our wife faces the added impediment of being ill-equipped with the personal tools of self-awareness, self-esteem and self-determination which aid recovery. When in turn the husband has the drinking problem (a disease which effects the whole family), the wife is likewise rendered powerless to break the cover-up system by herself, acting to encourage him to seek help. In rethinking our mission as chaplains, we need to take seriously our task "to promote the spiritual, religious, moral, corporate and personal well-being of members, their dependents, and other authorized persons."<sup>5</sup> This mission includes wives of active and retired personnel, who find themselves in situations like those mentioned above.

## THE NAVY WOMAN

A new role came for women as they began to serve within the ranks of the Navy. They first found a place in the Navy Nurse Corps,

---

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Navy Chaplains' Manual, OPNAV INSTRUCTION 1730.1, 3 October 1973, Section 1101.

established in 1908. World War I saw the first enlisted women working as yeomenettes, and in 1942 Congress opened the door for enlisted and officers in the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (WAVES). Thirty years later in 1972, the Chief of Naval Operations declared that they were to be fully integrated into the Navy.

There remains one final step: the assignment of women to combat duty. Unquestionably over the past seventy years the woman's position has greatly expanded in the Navy. Persons, notably Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., and groups, like the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Service (DACOWITS), have seen to the legal and financial equalization of women in the Navy. From my perspective, however, women still do not truly belong as full members. The fact remains that all branches of the militia draw their purpose from their preparedness for military combat. Anyone who is not allowed participation in that ultimate action of combat — for whatever reason — is only a partial member. Of course many women do not *want* to fight, but then how many healthy men are enamoured with combat? The responsibilities as well as the privileges of a nation should be shared by its people. My respect for the individual human person and her or his own decision-making ability convinces me that women and men are to be afforded equal opportunity and equal responsibility — even in the battle zone. If such a statement raises the hair on your neck, you may be sure that you have at least latent sexism in your attitudes. It is a very common reaction from both sexes. This is because all of us have carefully learned that men *protect* women, a relationship which serves the male power drive as well as the female dependence syndrome. Dehumanization is the result for both sexes. The man is forced into roles he may not constantly fit: unfailing strength when he sometimes feels weak, total adulthood when he sometimes yearns to be a little boy, always knowledgeable when he may inwardly feel confused. A woman, too, is denied her full personhood: never really making firm decisions for herself, never quite attaining adult responsibility, and never discovering fulfilling task alternatives to full-time homemaking and motherhood. When one sex dominates the other, both lose. Such limiting role expectations is a form of sexual oppression.

Sexism is prevalent in the Navy. As stated earlier, the Navy takes its identity from a masculine conception: strong, brave, powerful, undefeatable, adventuresome. Fighting is still identified with men, not women. Therefore the woman who joins the ranks finds herself (sometimes unconsciously) forced into male roles. To be successful she finds it necessary to be aggressive in the way her male counterpart expresses his aggressiveness. She tends to become hard with the same

hardness she finds in men. She develops her competitiveness in the terms of the men with whom she competes. In short she is compelled to become a man, and she never fully attains that goal. At the same time she is all too frequently viewed by the men not as a co-worker but as a sex object. For him, her greatest value is that her body is shaped as a receiver. Anything which threatens that aspect of her, devalues her. Thus the "uppity woman" is one who in any way rejects this sexual servitude role.

Navy sexuality also strongly effects the personal lifestyle of the woman. Not only is she masculinized in her approach to the job, but she confronts certain sexual expectations in her personal life. According to my own observations and those of a Navy psychiatrist and a line officer (both males) and enlisted personnel (of both sexes), the Navy woman is allowed three possibilities: she is either very available to men, prefers women, or is frigid and inconsequential. Duty stations can help to determine the impact of these lifestyles, the smaller and more remote ones engendering very intense pressures of conformity. Alcohol abuse has been found to occur as a frequent retreat mechanism for women under such pressures.

There is some variation in the manner in which these sexual pressures are imposed upon the enlisted woman as over against the woman officer. The enlisted does not receive the message in the subtle, guarded communication received by her higher ranking colleague. The blatant directness of the enlisted's sexual put-downs receives compounded tension when it is insisted from basic training onward that she be called a "lady." "Men and women of the Navy" would be simple enough terminology, however, the names we do use frequently reflect identity crises, a truism in this case. It is natural for men to want to go to sea. But any woman who would leave the home and sail <sup>6</sup> with the men is considered to have some identity problem, some ulterior motive to be a man or to get a man. We try, therefore, to contradict this image by the use of certain selected terms.

Of all the words we could choose, "lady" certainly exposes our sexual identity crisis. The roots of it in Old English (*hlāefdige*) and French (*hlāfdige*) meant "loaf-kneader." Webster says the obsolete use of the word was a "mistress of servants, a woman who looks after the domestic affairs of a family, the female head of a household." Current definitions (according to the *American College Dictionary*) include the following: (1) a woman of good family breeding or social position, or of good breeding, refinement; (2) a polite term for any woman; (3) in Great Britain, the wife of a high-ranking man; (4) a woman with propriety rights over a manor; (5) the Virgin Mary; (6) the mistress of

---

<sup>6</sup> Figuratively spoken, of course.



a household; (7) a woman who is the object of chivalrous devotion. Neither am I reflected in any of these definitions, nor are most of the women with whom I am acquainted. Of course my family was beautiful, but definition (1) is more fitting for a possession like an animal, not a person. Of course, I wish to be treated with kindness, but the idea of politeness has always had feminine and surface implications not necessarily indicating the genuine kindness of attitude sought out by us all. Clearly we have here a case of old wineskins which cannot hold new wine. We are maintaining the language and attitudes of feudal times at a period of history when women are saying: *We want to determine who and what we are; we are; we will no longer accept the roles imposed upon us in the past by possessive and oppressive men.* And I say: right on, sister. Claim your freedom to discover who you are as a whole human person.

## HERE I STAND

Is it any wonder that we need strong women leaders in all areas of human life to aid in this developing consciousness of women. Resistant men may blame the problems of this new era on the Women's Liberation Movement. I am convinced that it is none other than God who is ultimately behind this new birth of womanhood. He alone is the Creator. We have but to anticipate the revealing of His image and of ours. This is why I am a minister of the Gospel of God.

Interestingly enough, I have found my greatest acceptance among the line personnel (both officer and enlisted) and the least among the chaplains. One explanation for this was offered by a colleague and friend of mine who is a very senior ranking enlisted man. He suggested that I do not demonstrate the proper humility befitting a woman minister among her male, senior colleagues. Very possibly so. Never have I cultivated a humility to make me an "acceptable" female. I came to this job as a qualified and capable professional: not as one of the men, and not as a usual woman. Predicament: How does a man who is accustomed to a woman as wife, daughter, lover or secretary now relate to one who is his colleague? There is no instant right answer or behavior to this question.

Inappropriate reactions to the situation in my experience include name usage (e.g. Sweetie, Toots, Honey, Darling, etc.), conversation with heavy sexual innuendo, and a process I call invisibilizing. I recognize the great difficulty with which all of us are faced in adjustment to new roles. However it should be remembered that men and women are both being reshaped in the process. Men need to move

toward control sharing and women toward responsibility sharing. Everyone is threatened and unsettled by this sort of change.

Perhaps it would be helpful to state that while women are fighting a battle for whole personhood, it is not men who are the enemy. Rather, the foe is a system of oppression which engulfs us all. Thus women must confront the change within themselves from the lifestyle for which they were prepared to the lifestyle of which they are capable: a shift from a limited, comfortable, protected sphere to an exploding, limitless and exposed one. Men on the other hand are threatened with the loss of power through the sharing of control and the honest admission of their weakness and dependency needs. In no way, however, should we fear a neuterizing result, unless of course we either do not trust that God created us in his image as male and female (not as neuters who evolved sexuality), or we believe that we have already reached the fullest understanding and expression of human personhood intended by God. I personally trust that our Creator is in the process and will see us through our present identity crisis.

Human assistance along the way is nevertheless indispensable. Support systems involve those persons with whom we have intimate relationships, i.e., with whom we have the freedom and trust to open our inner selves. They may be of either sex and varied relationships. My primary support person is my husband. Far from the persistent assumption that a married woman is not free to pursue a profession (we never question a man's ability to handle marriage, parenthood and profession at the same time), we have discovered that together we allow each other to be fuller persons and more competent workers. We have challenged other myths also: that two within the same profession cannot live and work together, that the wife cannot be the primary wage earner, that two working parents cannot properly raise a child. It is different, very taxing, and fun!

I confess that encouragement also comes from those persons I encounter in my ministry. With male and female alike there seems to be an unexpected welcome to find a woman chaplain. There are certain benefits for a woman counselor: other women can sometimes be more open and relaxed with a member of their own sex; men (especially the young recruits) tend to relate well to a mother-figure and also experience a lack of the competitiveness frequently found between men; women who have had only negative relationships with men will more readily seek help if a woman counselor is available. There are many exceptions of course to the above statements but it is worth noting specific advantages of new roles. We do not all function alike just because we are people, nor even because we are the same sex, and we all need to be aware of the many approaches individual women will bring to their work.

I would like to emphasize finally that this report is simply one woman's experience and perceptions. I take full responsibility for all which I have written, and insist that in no way may these reflections be construed as official. They do not represent any group or any one other than the writer herself, who offers them with the intent that they may be constructive in the long run — over the trail stretching ahead of each of us — challenging all to be pioneers in new experiences of human life.



**AND KNOWLEDGE TO GAIN—**

### THE HEART OF A WOMAN

The heart of a woman goes forth with the dawn,  
As a lone bird, soft winging, so restlessly on,  
Afar o'er life's turrets and vales does it roam  
In the wake of those echoes the heart calls home.

The heart of a woman falls back with the night,  
And enters some alien cage in its plight,  
And tries to forget it has dreamed of the stars,  
While it breaks, breaks, breaks on the sheltering bars.

—Georgia Douglas Johnson

# THE SINGLE WOMAN

Sandra Lynn Daughton

"Are you dating anyone special these days?"; or more bluntly, "Why aren't you married?"; or incredulously, "Don't you want to get married?"; or concernedly, "Don't you get lonely?" and "How can you stand living alone?". I've been asked these questions and I still find myself responding in a manner that is either apologetic, defensive, or a deliberate attempt to be neither, which comes out being no answer at all. Whether the questioner understands it or not his queries imply that I must be (1) bored with sitting home and twiddling my thumbs without a "man in my life"; (2) attractive enough that some man should have snapped me up by now; (3) that I must be cold, distant and/or a man-hater (resisting the 'natural order of things'); and (4) unfulfilled and frightened. The tone of these questions is usually that of surprise and concern, with just the slightest hint of pity. The unspoken attitude is that being single is an uncommitted, self-centered, and incomplete existence, leaving one sitting on a fence in a state of limbo. After searching my own thoughts and feelings, calling to mind some expressed by other single friends, and reading books and articles that touch on the subject, I find that it all boils down to three questions: (1) are the assumptions accurate? (2) why or why not? and (3) does it have to be that way?

In a special new feature presented recently by a Sacramento, California, television station it was stated that there are forty million single men and women in the United States. Who and how many are the women without husbands of this country? In 1968 we were the nine million widows, the two million divorced or separated, and the three million never-married; a total of fourteen million.<sup>1</sup> We are single by either circumstance (divorce or death) or choice.

In *The Woman Alone* <sup>2</sup> Patricia O'Brien states, "Very few women actually choose singleness. It is more a process of rejecting alternatives . . ." To some it seems to be more a matter of knowing what one doesn't want than what one does want, or of not being in the

---

Ms. Daughton is a graduate of the University of Maryland (B.A.) with a major in French and a minor in Music. She has six years public school teaching experience and most recently participated in a nation-wide evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). Ms. Daughton has served as a Youth Director in military chapels. She also is a free-lance writer.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Single and Whole", Kathy Jan Johnson, *Women in a Strange Land*, Fortress Press, quoted from *Women Alone*, Isabella Taves.

<sup>2</sup> *The Woman Alone*, Patricia O'Brien, Quadrangle, the New York Times Book Co., 1973, p. 121.

right place at the right time. In my own case it is a combination of these things plus the realization that I had too much to learn about myself first and a desire not to burden a man with an unhealthy dependency.

All single people suffer from some of the same difficulties: primarily those of adjusting to being alone with themselves, developing self-reliance, and of finding acceptable social settings in which to meet others and cultivate meaningful, supportive relationships. The single man experiences many of the same "two-is-the-name-of-the-game" pressures as the single woman, especially if he doesn't fit the typically accepted masculine image. However, there is much less stigma attached to being a "bachelor". He is judged to be more of a loner and perhaps a bit of an eccentric. He is assumed to be sexually active and to be leading an enviably carefree and unburdened life. He may at first be at a loss in regard to housekeeping and cooking, due to a lack of preparation for these things in his upbringing; but he is much less conspicuous going out alone to eat and drink or for entertainment. Although some employment situations find a married man with a stabler image more desirable, the bachelor suffers much less discrimination in equal employment opportunity and pay than a woman. (After all, he won't be getting married, getting pregnant or leaving because his wife's job calls for relocating.)

For the single woman one of the biggest tangible problems is being accepted as an individual in her own right and not as an extension of a man; both in her own mind and in the minds of others. Related to this is the difficulty involved in learning to do things alone without feeling conspicuous, uncomfortable, and slightly guilty. There is a particular kind of attention that a woman doing something without the company of a man, or at least another woman, draws to herself. She is seen to be advertising her approachability and is thereby asking for what she gets in the way of a response. Many men assume that they have the "prerogative", as one friend put it, to look at or talk to a woman in a suggestive and demeaning manner, whether she is walking down the street, sitting in a restaurant, riding a bus or subway, or doing anything in a public place, while minding her own business. The society tells her to consider it a compliment, and if it doesn't happen, she had better take a look in the mirror. Personally, I get very tired of the open, sometimes leering stares that make it difficult to even look around the room without seeming to communicate a "come-on." This is indicative of a whole mentality on the part of men in our society (and throughout the cultural history of humanity) towards women as things: to be controlled, possessed, and used. There *is* a difference between a look that expresses a healthy appreciation of a woman's



attributes and one which communicates the kind of mental undressing that leaves a woman feeling exposed and naked. The line is sometimes very fine. I can't articulate the difference, but I know it instinctively. I have had, out of necessity, to analyze the effect of this mentality on my own freedom of movement and on my perception of the limits of that freedom. I have had to examine my options: my choices about where I'll go, what I'll do, under what circumstances, what risks are involved, and how much caution to exercise realistically in proportion to those risks.

Girls are taught, with some justification, to be suspicious and fearful of men and to mistrust their motivations. Fathers are as guilty as mothers, if not more so, in this regard. This says something about the self-concept that men have of themselves in relation to women. It is difficult programming to overcome in either case. Learning to be healthily trusting of others, when it is possible to do so, doesn't come easily. "The myth of innate feminine goodness says that women are inherently good and men inherently destructive . . . Not only does it freeze the male in the essentially negative role in human relationships, but it also minimizes his personal responsibility for his actions." <sup>3</sup>

A woman alone faces some very down-to-earth problems, related to the lack of emphasis placed on developing self-sufficiency in the rearing of girls. She usually has to learn how to maintain an automobile (after getting "ripped off" one time too many, I finally resorted to taking some automotive consumer protection courses), to effect minor household repairs, to deal with insurance, tax, and credit problems, and how to better protect her physical safety. The divorced woman often has to cope with the very real problems of grossly inadequate child care facilities, of being both parents to her children, of inadequate job training and work experience, and of discrimination in housing and credit. She has her former husband's credit rating and is viewed a poor risk on her own. If she has children, she is frequently denied housing in apartment complexes and cannot get loans to buy a house. The widowed woman often faces inadequate finances, lack of job opportunity not only because of insufficient training and experience but also because of her age, physical infirmity, and an almost total lack of social outlet. Moving from a state of dependency to one of independence for the divorcee and the widow is a tremendously difficult process. In her research O'Brien has found that most of these women never get beyond just coping for survival. "To move into a life alone that offers any real options, a woman has to move beyond the

---

<sup>3</sup> "Snips and Snails and Puppy Dog Tails", *Feminism from the Pulpit: Thirteen Sermons on Sex ETC.*, the Rev. Ms. Marjorie Newlin Leming, 1973, p. 16.

coping stage.”<sup>4</sup> The divorced woman has to deal with negative attitudes toward her on the part of married women who see her as a threat, and men who see her as being “on the hunt,” as well as with her own self-recriminations and sense of failure.\* The widowed woman, having lost all she was ever supposed to have ‘lived for’, is no longer invited to social events that she formerly attended with her husband, and, not being viewed as a person in her own right, is now identified as the widow of so-and-so. She is frequently engulfed with anger and confusion over the death she has encountered, a fear of aging, and the complications of dealing with a youth and marriage-oriented culture which has no place for her.

In the back of the minds of most single women looms the prospect of a solitary old age, in which the desire for companionship becomes intensified. Most do not consciously seek to spend their lives totally alone. In the pioneer days, men often went through two or three wives with childbirth and hardship killing women off at early ages. But in our society, the prospect of aloneness at the end of life is very real for all women, married or single. It strikes me that a married friend who once said to me, “But, *I want to be protected!*” may be avoiding considering and preparing for a very possible future reality.

For all single people, but women in particular, especially if they are beyond college age, there is a definite problem in finding places to meet people. The usual routes of singles bars, “swinging” singles apartments and some singles groups in churches just don’t meet the need. There aren’t many alternatives, and those there are, are quite inadequate. It is difficult for couples and families to be comfortable with single people and vice-versa. There seems to be a threat involved in accepting their life-style and the usual tendency is to match-make. Married women are definitely threatened by single women. A part of the problem is the exclusive nature of marriage, being couple-centered to the total exclusion of others. Relationships with female friends who marry, for me, have often had to change and become limited; their priorities change, their orientation and outlook change, and their commitment of time and energy becomes rechanneled. You, as a single woman, can fit in only to a certain point. You may still relate to that woman in the same way when alone with her, but in the presence of her husband both women begin to feel some tension. Whatever communication and sharing took place in the relationship before, may be altered. The single woman often feels that she might be infringing

---

<sup>4</sup> O’Brien, *The Woman Alone*, p. 121.

\* She often finds her motivations questioned, such as in the case of a friend who in her search for a larger apartment (a 2-bedroom) was suspiciously asked by the manager about her reasons, as a single woman, for wanting a 2-bedroom apartment.

on the privacy of the other, and doesn't feel free to maintain the same kind of contact. She is now seen to be a competitive threat. This kind of tension does not exist to the same degree for a single man and his married friends.

So this automatically creates the problem of finding other single people to relate to. Many singles groups in the church are very unsatisfactory experiences. With one exception this has been very true for me. These groups often attract older never-married singles who have never been able to really function socially "out there" and who have created for themselves a "buffer zone" against the reality of their situation. I found myself strangely repulsed by one group I attended. The reaction was a very strong sense of panic which I have never fully understood and still feel a little guilty about. There was something in the nature of that group that was almost parasitic. I've tried others and have found only one where these things were not basically true.

When it comes to the almost unspeakable subject of a single woman's expression of her sexuality, we are touching on a delicate and sensitive area for *all* single people, especially women. In contrast to the single man, the woman without a husband is expected to be sexually inactive, if she seeks social approval of her single status. The Rev. Marjorie Leaming, in a sermon entitled "Whatever Happened to Sex?" points out the paradox of this expectation in a society that encourages seductiveness in unmarried females and a neutralized sensuality in marriage. "In many societies a woman is considered neuter until she is married and then she becomes a full-fledged female, a sexual being . . . In our society the exact opposite is true." The appearance of young unmarried girls "is given a strong sexual emphasis even before there is anything to emphasize . . . But as soon as girls are married they are expected to mute their sexuality, and when they become mothers, this neutralization is carried even further." <sup>5</sup> The inherent contradiction is that the expression of a woman's sexuality is to be reserved for a blossoming in marriage, but the greatest emphasis on cultivating one's sensuality and projecting it is expected to take place before marriage and not after. After marriage, a woman is "spoken for" and is to subdue her natural femininity in the presence of any others besides her husband. She is now (I hate to say it) his possession.

Sexuality in our culture is very much connected with the externals of one's physical attributes and all the trappings designed to enhance them. The result is an emphasis on using artificial and sometimes restricting and uncomfortable means to cultivate the "image". We are bombarded with commercials selling products through the use of

---

<sup>5</sup> Leaming, *Feminism from the Pulpit*, p. 28.

blatant sexuality which are designed to keep us smelling and looking "right". Sexual imagery is used to sell totally neutral products which have no relation whatever to human sensuality. I often feel personally frustrated with the contradictory messages that the male society communicates to women in regard to their appearance. Be proud of your feminine endowments and show them off through the use of skirts, stockings, heels, make-up, long hair, the "natural" look . . . *But*, don't wear your skirts *too* short, your hair *too* extremely, your make-up *too* heavily . . . The problem is that each man has his own definition of how much is *too* much. According to this individual interpretation, if you overdo it you "deserve what you get." We are back to that previously mentioned "thing" mentality.

We operate under what seems to me to be a mistaken concept of sexuality and sensuality as conscious behaviors that are designed to attract and arouse the opposite sex, as opposed to being a natural part of one's humanness that is expressed in everything one says and does. A woman who is relaxed enough to be naturally sensuous is just being herself, often attracts unsolicited response to what is interpreted to be ulterior signals being sent out seeking such. She has to be constantly examining the non-verbal messages she is sending out for unconscious sexual undertones. Defining for oneself what is naturally feminine and what is a conditioned femininity is a continuing and constant process in these changing times.

How can today's woman integrate her native intelligence and her sexuality into a healthy whole? She has been so conditioned to attracting male attention and acceptance through "little girl" flirtatiousness and passivity. I've observed highly intelligent and articulate women, who can relate to other women in this way, slip into this pattern of precocious behavior in the presence of a man. I've caught myself falling into the same trap many times. The child-like innocence of the little girl in a woman is appealing and one of her most attractive qualities to a man. It triggers his need to protect and parent. When genuine and honest, this quality is a very real and meaningful part of a man/woman relationship. But to be freeing and not restricting, it must be mutually-shared. For most men, that kind of vulnerability and passivity is too threatening to reveal. It means letting go of their control of the situation.

That innocent child in a woman wants the protection coming its way, and many women, feeling it's the only way to "get" and "keep" a man will cultivate it. If she is physically well-endowed she will become a sexually-precocious child. Once she "gets her man" she keeps him by continuing to play the parent-child game, or she lets down and reverses the parent-child roles, often by becoming critical of her husband and children and surviving by manipulation.

Now we get down to a question of the exercising of power. Men and women struggle with each other through the use of dominant/active power against subordinate/passive power. Men have physical control of the world and with it they wage war. But psychological power in the home and in relationships has been relinquished to women by default. I personally became aware of how by osmosis I learned that the woman in any relationship, or group of relationships (primarily as wife and mother), is *expected* to assume the responsibility for the emotional health of all involved, often to the denial of her own. When the burden becomes too great, and she fails, then the fault is within herself; she is inadequate, weak, and a poor example of the ideal woman. For women who grow up thinking of themselves as finding fulfillment *only* within these role expectations, power becomes ulterior and manipulative. I recognized these tendencies within myself and came to a realization of their effect on my perception of myself as a woman. Women in general have a very poor image of themselves other than as reflections of the men in their lives, and the result is that they really can't relate to one another intimately without suspicion.

It is important to develop self-reliance, but without self-understanding and positive feelings towards oneself as a woman, it can simply be used as a defense against the world. All of us have a little child inside who is still frightened by the unknown and wants someone to protect us and embrace us and care for us. Self-reliance, if misused, can be a protection against accepting these things when they are offered. We fear the vulnerability involved in receiving them, and their possible loss. Men are caught up in this dilemma so much more than women. The answer for all of us lies in the developing of all the natural parts of our being: parental, adult, and child-like (borrowing from the terminology of transactional analysis). Women easily fall into parent-like and child-like behaviors because these are expected. But when it comes to the adult responsibility for our own actions, thoughts, and feelings, and in the use of the mind, we are all struggling like newborns. With a "still, small voice" that would not be silent, prodding me, I have always felt that my mind was a gift that was meant to be used and not denied. I believe, based on my experience, that the probing and thoughtful use of this gift, not without its uncertainties, is a healthy thing. I cannot relinquish it for the security of a relationship that would mask it; and must be prepared for the possibility that my path in life may be a solitary one.

For the single woman, her survival depends on her making the fullest use of her abilities. However, she still learns to think of her education as an "insurance policy against failure — something to help

pay the rent if a girl doesn't get married." <sup>6</sup> For me, the decision to go to college and the decision of a field of concentration, although based on my talents, abilities, and interests, were largely colored by what was socially acceptable for a woman and would be compatible with marriage and family, without placing too many strains on it. There was always a vague feeling that any decision was an either/or choice; that there was no way to juggle the responsibilities of both, within the definition of a woman's role in family life. For a man, marriage is seen usually as an enhancement to his career rather than an impediment. ". . . a man is raised with a sense of what he is to be, not whom he is to marry, and he is therefore identified by what he does." <sup>7</sup>

If there is one common human experience in which we all share at one time or another, it is loneliness. We seek to avoid it because we fear it. "The fear of being alone is a fear of the unknown." <sup>8</sup> Many people cannot spend time alone with themselves without experiencing severe depression. The unknown which they fear is within themselves. Many people marry to escape being alone. They often wind up being more lonely than single people, who eventually have to face themselves to find meaning in their life style. "I wondered about the isolation of women — not just the physical isolation of wives from a working world or wives from single women, or even the additional emotional isolation of women from men, but the psychic isolation that keeps so many women . . . particularly women without men, lonely yet with no capacity for aloneness." <sup>9</sup> Ms. O'Brien feels that men are often just as lonely but in a different way. A woman's loneliness comes in part "from her dependency, while a man's comes from the absolute requirement that he be not only independent but able to support a woman's dependency." <sup>10</sup> Ira J. Tanner has described loneliness as a fear of love, approaching a sickness which prevents a person from being able to obtain and accept that which he most desires. <sup>11</sup> O'Brien comments "It is arguable who among all women alone are left most bereft of support. Widows have their memories, divorced women their anger, and single women their cats." <sup>12</sup> "Widows are, in fact, probably the most physically restricted, most helpless women alone . . . widows suffer total role loss, an overwhelming event. . . ." <sup>13</sup>

But until one can be alone with oneself, she isn't really prepared to be in relationship. I'm learning to enjoy my own company, to do

---

<sup>6</sup> *The Woman Alone*, O'Brien, p. 93.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>8</sup> "Single and Whole," Johnson.

<sup>9</sup> *The Woman Alone*, p. 39.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 44.

<sup>11</sup> *Loneliness: the Fear of Love*, Ira J. Tanner.

<sup>12</sup> *The Woman Alone*, p. 63.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69.

creative things, to make my apartment a reflection of that creativity and of myself. I'm learning about the importance of maintaining it because it's *my* living environment and I deserve to have a pleasant one. (This kind of thinking helps me overcome the tendency to let things go because there is no one else there.)

One of the single woman's concerns about living alone is "what happens when I get sick, or am in trouble and need help?" Being one of the hardest questions to resolve, it relates to the need for a support community where she could be accepted and could contribute and could show care and concern for others without threat because of her single status. One of the limitations of being single, and alone, then, is a *lack of practice* in relating to others in a close, day-to-day, give-and-take way; learning to negotiate conflicts and freedoms, building something together as well as alone. There are often unmet physical needs, not necessarily sexual, for comfort and support. We all have a need to share our thoughts and experiences with another in a kind of giving of ourselves that is enhancing to our own development and growth.

The support community has traditionally been provided within marriage and family and the Church. In earlier times the family was closely tied to a larger family unit, spanning several generations. Thus, the family has formed the core of the Church. The Church has become a family-oriented institution, even though it was born within a non-family context. Christ himself, along with several of his disciples, was a single person. And the priesthood, within the Catholic church remains a single society. The Church today is only just beginning to recognize its neglect of support for those single persons within its ranks. Most church functions, pot-luck dinners for example, center on the family. Single people at these functions are somewhat conspicuous. Single men are often mothered by the women of the church who cook for them, invite them to dinner, etc., assuming that they need the TLC (tender loving care) and home-cooked meals that are not being provided by a wife. But a single woman, who is attractive and eligible, is watched carefully for flirtatious behavior, and for the externals of dress, hair style, make-up, etc. If she plays the "little girl", she may get some positive attention, but she is basically regarded as a misfit, and they either attempt to marry her off or ignore her.

Aside from the sense of competition that women feel with each other, what is behind this? First of all, we must deal with the implications of role fulfillment. A woman who doesn't marry and bear children isn't serving her biological function. Along with some of the other expectations within the family that I've already mentioned, she is rejecting the accepted view of the family as the basic social unit and as the core of the church. Very much behind this is the Old

Testament's account of Creation in which Eve is given the curse of the pain of childbirth as a punishment for bringing original sin into the world to burden humanity forever. Whether we accept the Bible as fact or not, whether we accept the validity of the Church or not, we are bound up in the Judeo-Christian culture in this country and cannot escape the residual effects of thousands of years of conditioning. On Eve and all of her "daughters" is placed the guilt and responsibility for sin, evil, pain, suffering, and destruction (mostly perpetrated by *men* in war) that is upon us all. In the middle ages, witchcraft, sorcery, black arts, and other evils were associated with female figures. The implications that these things still carry for us in regard to suspicion, mistrust, and fear of the powers of woman for control and manipulation are tremendous. The implications for women, in regard to their sense of guilt over being female and in regard to their negative view of themselves as women, are equally important to consider. In any church whose theology is based on a literal interpretation of the Bible, there is a built-in incapacity to regard women on any kind of equal basis with men. They must accept the guilt of Eve and, by extension, of *all* women for the sin of the world, and that by being born of a woman, one has been burdened with the sin of the whole history of humanity. For a woman, her very womanhood (over which she had no choice in the first place) is responsible for the placing of this weight on her own children and their future posterity. Is it any wonder that a positive self-concept within the church is difficult for a woman, and in particular a single woman, to achieve? And yet, unless a woman can begin to see herself more positively, how can her relationship with anyone else be more positive, including her husband and children?

Much of this negativism is still prevalent, and can be seen in current controversies over the fitness of women for the ministry and the priesthood. The Orthodox Jewish man still prays a prayer which says "Thanks be to God that He has not created me a woman." Women in Jewish worship were segregated to the outer areas of the synagogue or temple. Many New Testament writers were Jewish men who still carried these attitudes towards women into their teachings. Paul himself was sometimes guilty of this, although he did write, "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Galatians 3:28) Christ himself had very positive encounters with women in the New Testament in spite of the fact that He was criticized severely by religious leaders and by his disciples.

An enlightening book on the subject of the effect of a male-dominated religious system on women, (including an interesting analysis of many biblical references to women and to the nature of God) is *Women and Worship*, by Sharon and Thomas Neuffer



Emswiler.<sup>14</sup> They discuss the persistent use of the masculine gender in religious terminology. "If a male or female is constantly bombarded with masculine terminology . . . the result is to form the conclusion . . . that all life is lived in the masculine gender . . . Another problem raised by using 'man' and 'men' to denote both males and females is that the woman is not sure when she is supposed to be included and when she is not." <sup>15</sup> They conclude that by making more effort to refrain from sex-based language when speaking of God "it might help us to understand more clearly that God is Spirit and minimize our tendency to anthropomorphize God as 'the man upstairs'." <sup>16</sup>

This generation of women is undergoing a period of transition unlike any previously known period in human history. It is one in which the greatest amount of change ever known is taking place, at an increasing rate. There are incredible pressures being brought to bear on any institution that is not designed to cope with change. Marriage as an institution and the Church as an institution cannot escape this reality if they are to survive.

For these women, the pendulum must swing, as always, from one extreme to the other, and back to the center. The key is time: time for all the questioning, explosions of frustration and anger, self-doubt, and confusion to dissipate. The individual has to internalize and integrate into herself whatever truth she can glean from it all and then discover the personal power that she now has access to within herself. She has to redefine for herself what being a woman is going to mean for her as an individual and in the general society as a whole. It means that men must be prepared for change, and for a redefinition of their roles, and perhaps of their manhood; hopefully, in the direction of liberation from the kinds of restrictions that prevent many of them from knowing and accepting who they really are.

Does supportive community and intimacy have to be reserved exclusively for and self-contained within the marriage relationship? I say, not necessarily. Most of us would, if we were to admit it, desire to share ourselves completely with another. For those of us who see this experience as an extension of our spirituality and of the God within, there is a hope of finding it in marriage, but the early Church provided it outside of that framework. If the Church today can be open to change, and can get in touch with what it has forgotten about its purpose, it can begin to provide for all its people: adult or child, married or single. Kathy Johnson states "It must revise its understanding of 'family' — which supposedly means the 'family of

---

<sup>14</sup> *Women & Worship*, Sharon Neuffer Emswiler, Thomas Neuffer Emswiler, Harper & Row, 1974.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

God' and not just a structure to meet the needs of nuclear families . . ."17 The church could provide strength and support for me if it would begin to affirm my singleness as surely as it affirms marriage, if it were to see me as a full person, with needs different from those of the married couple or family, with my own talents and abilities, my own pain and joy, and my ever-increasing possibilities for becoming whole.

I can add no more. SO BE IT.

---

<sup>17</sup> "Single and Whole", Johnson.

# THE MODERN MILITARY WOMAN: A PROFILE

Brigadier General Mildred C. Bailey

In January 1953, the Chief of Military History, United States Army, wrote the foreword for a volume titled *US Army in World War II, Special Studies, The Women's Army Corps*. He concluded by saying "The WAC did not always understand the Army—its customs and traditions, its organization and necessary chain of command. The Army did not always understand the WAC — its needs and temperament, and the many other things that man, being the son of woman, should have known but did not, much to his continued embarrassment." If this volume of 841 pages could be summed up in one sentence, it would be a conclusion drawn by the author that, "While parallel, the problems of the employment of men and women were by no means identical in nature or solution."

If we are to understand women in the Armed Forces today, we must review past history; for integrating women into the Army has merely been a part of their evolving status in civil life. If you have the idea that women's participation in the Armed Forces is new or confined to the twentieth century, you will be surprised to learn that women have actively participated in war and conflict since at least 2100 years BC.

While home defense has always been a readily acceptable activity for women, most nations in the twentieth century have adopted the idea that women should not fight in combat, many having passed laws to that effect.

Much has been written and said to the effect that women are not physically or psychologically capable of participating in warlike activities. In reality, they have always done what was necessary at the time. The record of women's contributions and sacrifices stand as a witness to their ability and spirit. It has been custom, tradition, mores, and need that have historically determined a woman's role in war.

In the United States, women have always been welcome close behind the fighting line or even on it in times of military emergency; however, it was not until 1901 that the Army Nurse Corps was established within the Medical Department of the Army. The Navy Nurse Corps followed in 1908.

In 1917, the Navy Department and Marine Corps enlisted women, the first in the history of the United States. These women were used in administrative shore duties and were discharged in the months following the Armistice. This was due to the fact that an emergency no

---

General Bailey is the Director of the Women's Army Corps.

longer existed, and Congress had enacted legislation prohibiting the enlistment of women.

The Japanese bombing at Pearl Harbor in 1941 found our country unprepared for all-out war. At that time, large numbers of American women were asked to leave their sheltered home environment and traditional working roles to assume many types of war work, including service in the Armed Forces.

The Army was first to seek authority to enlist and commission women. On May 14, 1942, Congress authorized the formation of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC). The WAAC was an auxiliary to the Army with no military status, its members holding comparable grades and ranks. Within a six-month period the Navy and Marine Corps asked for and received similar legislation; however, their women had military status from the beginning. Women were also enlisted and commissioned in the Coast Guard during World War II.

In September 1943, the status of the WAAC was changed from an auxiliary to the Women's Army Corps (WAC) and became part of the Army of the United States.

In World War II, 350,000 women served in the Armed Forces. At the end of hostilities, contrary to previous history, women were not totally demobilized, although their numbers were drastically reduced. Like previous history, however, with the passing of the emergency, women were once again relegated to the traditional "women's jobs." Public acceptance of women in dirty, physically demanding, "unladylike" work, as a wartime expediency, was one thing — but changed in a peacetime environment. Women who had answered the call to wartime duty in the Armed Forces and considered patriots for doing so, now became suspect. Their motivation, character, and morals were questioned.

In response to adverse public opinion, women were removed from "masculine" jobs such as mechanic, truck driver, machinist, law enforcement, etc. It was back to the typewriter, the file cabinet, the desk, the switchboard, the hospital ward, and the kitchen for the majority of women. If existing laws did not require it, the services quickly established policies and regulations which served to deny the servicewoman all the benefits and privileges enjoyed by the man. Such laws and policies were justified as protective and were very much in step with tradition and the times.

In the following years, a half million servicewomen worked diligently and effectively to prove their competence, gain acceptance of their status, and recognition of their contributions. Slowly and often painfully, they chipped away at prejudice, misunderstanding, intolerance, myth, and inequity. It was a natural evolution of any new cultural phenomenon, with mistakes and experiments, blind opposition

by opponents of change, the enthusiasm of a pioneering minority, slander by a less venturesome majority, gradual adjustments and eventual success with some remaining residual problems.

The Women's Armed Forces Integration Act authorizing the enlistment and commissioning of women in the Regular Armed Forces and enacted in June 1948, is still the basis for the women's components, other than the Medical Corps, as we know them today.

Until 1972, strength ranged from 2,000 in the Marine Corps to 13,000 in the Army. The mission of the women's components was to augment the peacetime forces, but primarily to serve as a trained nucleus around which to build an emergency mobilization expansion.

Thirty-three years ago when the WAAC was founded, the average American woman was expected to become a full-time wife, mother, and homemaker. Few women possessed the courage or education to embark on a full-time career in an established profession. Those who did, normally entered professions traditionally reserved for women — nursing or teaching. Women who dared to storm the bastions of male-dominated professions were looked upon at best as pioneers and, at worst, as threats to the femininity of all American womanhood.

## THE MILITARY WOMAN TODAY

Today's situation is different. Many young women do not see the fulltime "wife-mother-homemaker" stereotype as their ideal image. They believe they have the ability and the right to be successful in any profession of their choosing and see nothing incongruous about seeking marriage, motherhood, *and* a career. This change in women's expectations, combined with society's growing recognition of women as a productive work force, has created a climate in which their job opportunities have become vastly expanded and societal attitudes on the role of women have begun to change.

The past five years have seen more changes in laws, regulations, and policies concerning uniformed women than the entire preceding twenty-eight years. These changes are varied and comprehensive ranging from elimination of laws that prohibited women's participation in many military programs to integration of units and personnel management of women.

Three changes have had profound and far-reaching effects.

In 1971, a policy was eliminated that required uniformed women who attained responsibility for a minor under eighteen years of age to be separated from service; in 1972, married women were permitted to apply for enlistment or appointment for the first time; and in 1973, a Supreme Court ruling declared unconstitutional the law that denied a

married servicewoman the same family entitlements as her male counterpart.

Of all the changes, these are the most significant because they offer the servicewoman the opportunity for a long-range career as opposed to a short term job. Prior to 1971, unless a woman was unmarried and without dependents under eighteen, it was virtually impossible for her to think in terms of a military career. In the first case, she had many psychological and cultural obstacles to overcome and in the second, was required to terminate any affiliation with military service. Today, she has an individual choice. The same psychological and cultural factors, however, still create many problems for her.

In the years ahead, women will have a greatly expanded role in the Armed Forces and will dramatically increase in strength. Increased numbers of women are vital to the completely volunteer concept. Also, societal pressures demand expansion of the utilization of women in the interest of equal opportunity.

With the exception of combat specialties, a woman's job opportunities, pay and allowances, benefits, housing, retirement, and opportunities for advancement are the same as those of her male counterpart.

Women's motivation for seeking military service parallels that of the male volunteer. They seek training and educational opportunities that will provide a job skill, new interests, and environment. They hope for interesting, challenging, meaningful employment, and recognize the necessity of national defense.

The principle that opportunity in education, employment or other endeavor must *not* be based on gender, race, religion or ethnic group but on the quality of talent, capability, performance, and diligence is broadly accepted today. Agreement on principle, however, does not solve all the problems that trouble the woman who chooses a career, especially a military one. While society has outlawed concrete forms of prejudice, it will take more than legislation to undo entrenched psychological bias.

Relations between Army men and women have developed from past circumstances hampered by ignorance and a lack of understanding about each other's life, standards, and attitudes. Both sexes have trouble accepting the very idea of a woman being active rather than passive, decisive rather than compliant or authoritative rather than subservient. Generally speaking, women in the past have been valued in the work force for negative qualities such as lack of independent judgment, absence of initiative, and no display of ambition.

In recent DA research on the reenlistment and retention of effective women in the Army, we found that a strong majority of the women interviewed (77%) believed joining the Army was a good decision,

including those who did not plan to reenlist. Their “gripes” generally reflected very practical, pragmatic, everyday kinds of concerns (living conditions, work problems) rather than complaints about issues or policies of the Army. What was made very clear, however, was that there is a deep-seated problem underlying their complaints. It relates to how enlisted women feel others view them. It could be described as the “Self-Image of Women in the Army.” The majority felt that enlisted women have a poor reputation among the public and servicemen. Although they did not view themselves in this light, they indicated they were tired of having to defend themselves to others. They felt that others were watching their every move, that they were a repository for everyone’s stereotyped expectations.

The impact of this image perception is pervasive from the moment a woman starts thinking about enlisting. It is an important contribution to why enlisted women leave the Army and can be devastating to their morale and sense of well-being. This *must* be understood if one is to understand why Army women react as they do to given circumstances and could be unduly sensitive to certain attitudes and actions.

## CONFLICT AND STEREOTYPING

There are clues as to why there is conflict and misunderstanding when women depart from any previously hallowed traditions or custom, whether it involves work, home life, or conduct. For example, stereotyping is prevalent daily in much of our society’s thinking and plays an especially important role in attitudes toward women. It matters little what a woman does. She is seen first as a woman and only secondly as a performer of deeds. Men and women have been taught to follow different behavior patterns, both on the job and in all phases of their lives. In addition, women are saddled with overcoming negative assumptions and expectations about their ability, suitability, motivation, and behavior.

One firm has researched the question of why there is so much anguish on the part of men on the subject of “women in business” which appears equally applicable to the Armed Forces. The conclusions reached are thought-provoking with the key word being *fear* — the fears men have concerning women on the job, women as peers and colleagues:

- Men believe that women are unable to divorce their personal and social interests from their work.
- Our culture and business society have not taught men to work with women whose *only* relationship to them is that of co-worker, professional colleague.

- With very few exceptions, men have had no “life models” for a business relationship between men and women. Women are mothers, wives, sweethearts, girlfriends, relatives.
- Men fear that career women will exploit their physical needs, their vulnerability, and that a woman’s sex gives her a strong competitive edge.
- Men do not trust women’s emotions. Most feel that emotional responses of women to business problems are unpredictable, therefore untrustworthy.
- Men fear woman’s superiority. It is a statistical fact that women live longer than men. This physical superiority gives rise to other fears about women as a physically superior being. They fear women’s power to challenge them sexually, because they expose men to the possibility of failure at a basic and biological level.
- Men believe that the “career” woman, especially the single one, has more ability to concentrate on her career, free to focus her full force on career goals, while he is forced to spread himself thin, playing a variety of roles.
- Men believe that they are not dealing with ordinary women on the job but with work-freaks of some kind, demented women who want to be facsimile men.
- Men are afraid of losing their identity. Our culture has led us to believe that a man is what he does for a living. If women also do what he does for a living, is he less than he was? Less than a man ought to be? Are his victories made small because women enjoy them?
- Men cope with a “second person fear.” The fear that men’s wives have of the women with whom they work, the woman who is a co-worker, peer, and equal to their husbands.

Women have their fears also, either the same or parallel to those of men. The rationale may be somewhat different; but the results are the same, misunderstanding and conflict. And in their search for equal status and opportunity they encounter many hazards.

- A serious pitfall for women is the temptation to make man the enemy, to indulge in a blanket accusation that men have oppressed women. Women should instead develop an awareness of the socio-economic and historical reasons for women’s assignment to limited or subordinate roles in our social and economic life; and wonder whether man might be, *not* an enemy, but a *victim* of the same attitudes that keep women from fully realizing their potential.
- A second hazard is the risk of “becoming like a man.” If a woman’s perception is that masculine qualities seem to assure success, it is to be expected that she would then imitate those qualities resulting in



- ludicrous and sometimes offensive conduct. A woman should not strive to "act like a man." Instead, she should act like herself.
- A third hazard is an unrealistic appraisal of responsibilities. Before a woman decides upon a professional career, she must assess the strength of her commitment. How much is she willing to give? Is she ready to meet the demands of study and time? Does she have the stamina? Does she understand that her duties will be measured not by a time clock, but the demands of the job? How much responsibility is she willing to assume?
  - And perhaps the most crucial hazard of all is the loss of so-called woman's security. All women have to make a decision on "what to do about a man." Should she marry the man in her life? If there is not a man in her life, she is probably wondering if she will find someone she can love and who will love her. Should she choose marriage, a career, or both? In the past, young girls were taught that their proper future was marriage and children and let the man be responsible for their future — their security. This generation knows that women have a choice but there are questions she must ask herself. Will she be forced to make a choice between a career and family? If she chooses marriage and a career, is she prepared to meet the demands of her job and her home? Or will she neglect one because of the other? Can her husband and she have equal respect for the demands of each other's career? Will he care as much about her success as she cares about his?
  - Women too face an identity crisis today. They may fear changes in values, in human relations. They are asked to accept a new concept of themselves as women with new, non-traditional conduct and tasks expected of them. They probably expect a different life than that offered to young women a generation ago. They do not see themselves by reason of their sex as "property" but with the rights of a person. They want to belong to a family unit but not based on economic necessity, or the supremacy of one member of the family. Tradition and cultural patterns pull them in one direction while their desire to sample new liberty and opportunity push them in another.
  - The basic inequality in the way Western society treats men and women is, that no matter how much women may be welcomed in public roles that have been the realm of male activity, they are still responsible for the tasks of caring for their children and homes. This will not necessarily change as women gain new legal and economic rights. What is most needed is to work out new and diverse ways in which men and women can share equally in the responsibility for the children they want to have and the life they lead together.
  - A woman's success inevitably takes place within a man's world, on his terms; praise is praise for him; status, position and salary are

granted by him. It is hard for a woman who achieves some success to escape the slight suspicion that she is guilty of having sold out for any gains she has achieved.

—Because men and women communicate through screens of guilt, fear, ignorance, habit, social assumptions and repressions, it is hard for men to discuss reasonably anything involving a woman's self-interest and even harder for women to take a stand for their own interests without seeming obstinate or ill-tempered.

Servicewomen share in all these sex-oriented conflicts and misunderstandings with some additional ones. While American women have made a contribution in all the wars in which this country has been engaged from our initial fight for freedom, to the wars preserving that freedom, and those fought to preserve the freedom of other nations, until very recently, their services were frequently unwelcome and their role restricted.

Today, we know that we can and must provide young American women a personally satisfying and professionally rewarding experience for one enlistment or for a lifetime career. We need awareness, awareness of fact as opposed to untested myth, our own unrecognized attitudes, and how they impact on our personal behavior.

We have wiped out the laws, regulations, and policies that served to discriminate against uniformed women. We cannot, however, take for granted that truly equal opportunity will automatically follow. It will happen only if we refuse to be complacent and assume responsibility for action to eliminate discriminatory practices and change negative attitudes.

Servicewomen have a solid foundation on which to build. Today, they need support and assistance in placing their role-oriented conflicts and anxieties in perspective. Those who seek non-traditional fulfillment and life patterns must be encouraged to enjoy and exercise their options freely without fear of rejection, retribution or loss of self-esteem while those who choose to pursue traditional careers or family patterns must be encouraged to do so with pride, without guilt, discomfort, or apology.

Army chaplains represent a great wealth of training and experience and an unexcelled opportunity to contribute guidance and counseling to these young women as they seek their place in the Army and settle into new roles and environment.

Mutual understanding, acceptance and trust can enhance our relationships and contribute to the Army's mission accomplishment.

**AND CHANGES TO RECOGNIZE—**

## FOREVER WOMAN

You tell me that  
you think of me  
as young and beautiful  
and laughing.  
I feel uncomfortable with that.  
Time, the elusive thief,  
has robbed me of my springtime.  
My summer, too, has been  
stealthily swept away.  
I never willed its passing.  
My laughter is less volatile  
in the autumn of my life.  
I was not yesterday  
as I shall be tomorrow.  
Change is the only constant.  
In my search for freedom  
I have sometimes built walls.  
That which once I deemed sacred,  
again and again I profane.  
And like so the opposite.  
In my quest for fulfillment,  
now and then I find emptiness.  
Yet in being true to myself  
I grow in my grace.  
My acceptance of me is paramount.  
Beyond all my failures  
and my treasured success,  
beyond the games that I play  
and my unpredictable moods,  
I am happy. I am timeless.  
Touch me, Hear me. Know me.  
I am a woman . . . I am a wife.  
I am a mother . . . I am a child.  
I am forever woman.  
I feel comfortable with that.

Delle Cox

---

Delle Cox is the wife of Chaplain (LTC) Billy Howard Cox and the author of *The Heart Is Sometimes Awol*, a book of illustrated poems — recently published by Jobitt-Cowood, Box 419, Killeen, Texas 76541 — reflecting her experiences, impressions and observations of life as a military wife.

## TURNING THE WORLD RIGHT SIDE UP

Clare B. Fischer

Their work was not for themselves alone, nor for the present generation, but for all women of all time. The hopes of posterity were in their hands and they were determined to place on record for the daughters of 1976 the fact that their mothers of 1876 had asserted their equality of rights . . .

Elizabeth Cady Stanton

A major symbolic victory was won for the American woman nearly one hundred years ago on the occasion of the Centennial Celebration at Philadelphia's Independence Hall. A group of dedicated feminists led by Susan B. Anthony, defying the rules of propriety, risked ridicule in order to demand that the Nation heed woman's grievances and affirm her rights. Having been excluded from the formal ceremony, although they had previously requested participation, the women invaded the assembly and delivered copies of the Woman's Declaration of Rights to a surprised audience. The drama and the message — breaking the silence to register the concerns and hopes of all sisters — reverberates through the decades to the present.

As we commemorate the American Bicentennial, recalling our heritage, we must assess whether the efforts of our grandmothers brought us closer to equality. There is a wide-spread belief that woman's place in society has progressively improved since the ratification of the suffrage amendment. Innumerable examples are offered about the increased participation of women in all aspects of American life. But, has the self-esteem and self-actualization of the modern woman been achieved? Are occupational choices and wages for work done on par with those of men? Has a century of technovation promoted the dignity of the wife and mother? My answer is no. The second wave of feminism alerts us to the serious discrepancies between the myths of personal and social advancement and reality. The resilience of traditional sexual social role understandings — what is "masculine," what is "feminine" — bars the way to an authentic equality.

I would like to review some of the presuppositions about woman's role in American society, and assess the implications of current and projected work and family roles in relation to the goals of the present liberation movement. We have learned that the most obvious patterns,

---

Ms. Fischer is a Ph.D. candidate in the Sociology of Religion at the Graduate Theological Union Berkely. She is currently writing her dissertation on the theology of work. She is a co-editor with Betsy Brenneman and Anne McGrew Bennett of *Women in a Strange Land: Search for a New Image*, Fortress Press, 1975.

those often so close that we take them for granted, are the very beliefs and behaviors which block our struggle for justice. Few feminists have taken up the issues raised by the earlier generations of activists, sensing that the claims are dated, obsolete. I regard the commitment of the nineteenth century feminist, on the contrary, as a source of both insight and tactic. While it is probably unrealistic to promote the identical slate, nothing can be more fortifying to action than a realization that there is continuity in our aspirations. Our foremothers, despite their optimism about the progressive character of historical change, recognized that the inflexibility of social institutions was tied to the dominant position of men who had much to loose in the restructuring of social roles.

We perceive that the mood and movement of today's feminism differs from that of our predecessors. But our vision of a radically new place is shared. Our objectives depend upon a consciousness of the root problems and the strategic errors of earlier activism. It is critical that we return, over and over again, to the basic issues in order to know our effort and create a community of values. What follows is a preliminary discussion of some of those fundamental concerns. The survey of sexual social roles reiterates what we live in our routine and often omit in our social criticism.

## SEX ROLES AND GENDER DISTINCTION

Too often we are reminded that sexual social roles are facets of human nature and that nature is fixed and right. Traditional approaches to the sciences of *man* (biology, linguistics and semantics, as well as the social sciences) affirm the dichotomy of male and female, attaching certain attributes to the pair. The notion of gender has been one of the assumed categories of analysis which has been echoed in pastoral life and assimilated into theological discussion. It has remained as static and absolute as its application to woman's identity — immutable and beyond challenge.

Gender distinction, in all but the human species, is merely a method of differentiation. Structures and functions have been classified male and female for descriptive purposes. Not so for the human species! The descriptive opposition of humankind is transformed into a prescriptive order. The facts culled by physiologists and geneticists, not to mention embryologists and psychologists, have been swept up by a moral force which ascribes a "proper sphere" to male and female. Woman resembles other mammalia in her depiction — more animal than human — as she is exclusively understood in relation to her primary and secondary sex characteristics. She *is* her body, a reproducer of the species, assuring survival and the repetition of her kind. It is fitting, the argument of biological determinism goes, that she conceive and

bring forth new life, devoting all of her person to this effort. Her nature is dominated by her hormones; she lactates, she menstruates. All of these mysterious and good capacities have a singular objective which translates as mother-nurturer. Symbolically speaking, the milk of her body is the continuity of life.

The male, conversely, is not primarily a reproductive actor in the human species, although his participation is critical to the species' survival. His definition is open-ended and substantively complex. We know him as *homo faber*, the builder of shelters, cities, and the things we use to adapt ourselves. He assures both his offspring and himself of an endless creativity. Unlike the female, he transcends his body; his physiological character is perceived as externally directed. His hands are extensions which reach out beyond him and carve the earth. His mind, free from the restraints of bodily imperatives as well, reaches out beyond a time past and present, through his plans and projections, into a vision of what might be. How different the natural dispositions of the two sexes are, according to this scheme of activity!

How different, indeed, is the moral undergirding of "biological destiny" for the human male and female. Our perspective, in all likelihood an inheritance from the ancient Greek, assumes an elegance and justice in the opposition of spheres. The biological predispositions of male and female are held to be in harmonious balance, possessing a functional value which reflects the order of nature and the cosmos. This interdependence, a justification for fundamental inequity, reminds one of the impasse experienced by the small and larger child on a see-saw. Woman remains down, her biological being trivialized and self-limiting. Resembling the classic definition of Nature, she, too, is obliged to repeat her activities, passively awaiting stimulus and action from another. Her moral code is written in the language of receptivity, compliance, obedience; her actions are evaluated in what she offers to the other. The male of the species is never understood as a singularly motivated being. His encounters with the world are clusters of activity; he is enticed to experiment and risk himself.

The risking responsibility of the male coincides with much of the contemporary ethical discussion of right and wrong, good and bad. We are assured that our actions cannot be ethical unless the fullness of self is authentically expressed. But woman's place is partial and restraining; it precludes ethical action so understood. If woman is only her hormones and seasonal appetites, subject to the regularities of the moon, how can she function as a responsible being? Can she communicate an integrity, when so little of herself has been identified and appreciated? Not morally permitted to act outside of her rightful sphere, she has neither risked integrating those other potential selves which belong to her wholeness, nor chanced being a mover of the

things of this world. Until the boundaries of her sphere disappear, and the disparate understandings of place give way, there will be distorted morality and a tottering, imbalanced social order. The removal of all moral imperatives from biological description should foster a new way of seeing possibility. But our hopes for anything approximating the idealized harmony of the ancient vision must await the radical redefinition of human purpose.

Along with our emancipation from false imperatives about our proper place, we must also be alerted to other implications of gender distinction. One of the most pervasive and divisive motifs is that related to natural aptitude. We have heard something about the inequities of IQ examinations from the point of view of racial criteria. We might identify, as well, those stereotypes which promote sexist imagery. Although the measurement of aptitudes by educators and psychologists, for the purpose of assessing genuine sexual difference in performance (verbal skills, social adaptability, spatial reasoning, etc.), contributes to our knowledge about human differences, I am wary of the conclusions such study inadvertently leads to. Separate dispositions to express oneself and to act are not indices for ranking superior and inferior persons. Unfortunately, there is a strong tendency to collapse the measurement of aptitude into the measurement of better or best student, worker, citizen. Moreover, those aptitudes associated with women are trivialized and perceived as lesser qualities for life's demands. Given the earlier discussion of morality and biology, I reiterate my fear of tyrannical processes which cast over human potential a dark, inhibiting shadow.

Role theory escapes much of the fixity and absolutism of theories derived from "anatomical destiny." The simplistic assessment of identity and place based upon physiological traits is set aside for a dynamic understanding of people seen acting in social settings. The social role of men and women, described as flexible, open-ended, expansive, is associated with learned behavior governed by the norms and exigencies of certain social institutions (family, school, job, etc.). However, the urge to dichotomize and classify human behavior in symmetrical pairs has not been forsaken by the sociologist. In place of the biologist's opposition of male-producer, female-reproducer we encounter the rubrics of "masculine" and "feminine." The residue of nature as a given re-emerges embellished in intricate clusters of attributes.

Unmistakably, the mother-nurturant model provides the basis of what we come to identify with the "feminine" in society. Woman, withdrawn into the space of the home and the family, derives her identity from the linear daughter-wife-mother motif. The role language associated with her social patterning is unambiguous:



emotive, supportive, cooperative, communal, etc. Even in her parenting relationship it is she who "deprives" her children of her company when she isn't in the home. (Her husband's absence is referred to precisely as "absence.") We most frequently hear of the feminine as submissive, dependent, passive and loyal. Conversely, the masculine cues to appropriate behavior are expressed in words like: rational, competitive, innovative, responsible, task-oriented, etc.

It is noteworthy that studies conducted around the sociology of the woman have been traditionally attached to the description of the family. The framework for understanding sexual social roles is closely connected with the ideology of social harmony and the reciprocity of action. Mediating social roles, described as "expressive" and "instrumental," are formulated as functional expressions of societal health. Propounded in the theory of Talcott Parsons and R. Bales (*Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, 1953), expressive-wife and instrumental-husband assure their progeny and the society at large of a predictable, stable order. The wife is located in the home, bringing to bear her skills in domestic maintenance; she is the "feminine" in relationship to all of the persons and things which impinge upon the home. Her husband, conversely, is the facilitator who connects his nuclear family unit with the multiple, intricate activities of the world. Credence is given to this view by the psychological speculations of Erik Erikson in his, now classic, essay on "inner and outer space" (E. Erikson, in Robert Lifton, ed., *The Woman in America*, 1965).

The woman who works, or the man who doesn't, are understood as dysfunctional persons. Considerable research in the past decade has been undertaken to determine what impact the working wife has had on the family; what adjustments are made in the face of such contradiction. At the turn of the century, less than twenty percent of the total labor force in the United States was represented by women, and of that number only a small percent were married and had young children. This is no longer the social reality. Almost forty percent of the labor force is made up of women, and a substantial number of the women wage earners are wives and mothers as well. Although woman has increasingly assumed an instrumental role, from the perspective of her physical place, her work activity remains expressive. One economist emphasizes that the dramatic increase in numbers of working women in no way reflects a move toward job equality. Women carry their expressive roles into the marketplace, securing employment in occupational categories generally identified with the service sectors of the economy. They tend shops, answer phones, provide attractive front-office geniality. Often their employment has no direct relationship to their education, training, aptitude, not to

mention their aspirations. Their male counterparts continue to be in preferred positions, tracked to promotion and executive responsibility.

## CONSEQUENCES OF SEXUAL DISTINCTIONS

What are the consequences of this "he" and "she" world of roles to the real issues of social order and moral stability? The over-employment of men (even in a period of great unemployment) persists, the under-utilization of woman's skills and knowledge grows. Government agencies and corporations ponder over the questions of job dissatisfaction, low morale and women remain outside the responsible offices where their contribution might offer some solutions. Job segregation has not ceased; women entering new positions previously held by men either fill gaps or reduce the status of the occupation. The assumption that woman does not belong, cannot function, feeds the mythic notions which preclude an authentically harmonious order.

The many women who continue to be home-makers, who often refer to themselves as "just a housewife," tend their children, provide refuge for their husbands and do approximately 250 billion dollars worth of housework (according to the Chase Bank studies of housework in the nation's income). They are isolated from friends, subject to the occupational mobility of their spouses, and incredibly occupied with the order of their space. Identified recently by John Galbraith, the economist, as "crypto-servants," the average American woman performs the duties previously done by the hired domestic, only more so. In addition to her expressive role as wife and mother, involving housekeeping and child-care, she is the economic manager of the family unit. It is she who markets, who plans and controls the purchases of the household, and through her efforts the consumer economy is assured of expansion.

Related to the consumption activities of the wife, whose expenditure of energy and time is directly connected with her husband's ambitions, is the pattern identified as the "two-person, single career" marriage (Hannah Papanek, in Joan Huber, *Changing Women in a Changing Society*, 1973). Located primarily in the middle-class family where the husband's employment requires substantial involvement and presence of his spouse, the achievement of the latter is identified with vicarious experience. Perhaps no pattern exemplifies the subsidiary, yet critical, character of woman as expressive partner better. We see this partnership especially in the corporate, military and ministerial life. Although the wife receives no compensation for her participation in her mate's work, and technically remains expressive in her functions, she is instrumental in the success of his worldly engagements. Her

gratification is derived from his ability to climb in status. His success is, in large part, dependent on her skills and support.

Woman in the home, or woman employed in the economy, cannot escape from the contradictions of social role and institutional changes. They are increasingly conscious of the strains put upon them by traditional sets of expectations. In the past, it was socially right and morally tenable to serve others, and justify all routine giving as a woman's "way." No comforting assurance can be given to the selfless woman of today; her self-effacement is perceived as manipulation. Instead, the recovery of identity secured through self-exploration and social experimentation (especially in support groups — women's rap groups) has moved the conscious woman permanently away from traditional understandings. There is no return for her to the expressive role, the woman's sphere; resumption would mean acceptance of personal negation. This momentum among women will not stop short of social institutions; the family, the school, the job will change. How that future society will look I do not know. But I do recommend that all of us inquire how the transformation of the social order can take place without too much jeopardy to the actors and the non-actors of our immediate and larger communities.

## EQUALITY OR LIBERATION?

The thematic push of last century's woman's movement was in the attainment of equal rights; to be full participants in the family, city, world. The American Declaration of Independence was symbolically affirmed and rewritten by the feminists of Seneca Falls (1848). Promoted as the Woman's Declaration of Rights, the activists of the nineteenth century conducted campaign after campaign to achieve equality by legislative fiat. They were politically astute, recognizing that women would rally around the fundamental document of the nation. More, they were wise in perceiving the symbolic vitality of that statement of outrage and commitment. Are we equally moved to demand relief from oppressive power and recognition of our personal autonomy? Do we believe that an entirely new start (like the young America) can be made?

Today's liberation movement is considerably less unified than that of our foremothers. Its diffuse character and ambiguity in objective may well be its strength. There are proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment who may have little in common with socialist, or gay liberation feminists. And the women who cannot relate to political issues may see that the priority lies in the psychological or support group effort. Such diversity does not easily lend itself to analysis of processes for change. In an article by Alice Rossi ("Sex Equality: The

Beginnings of Ideology," *Humanist*, 1969) one model is provided, which I find very instructive. She describes a triad of approaches to equality: *pluralism*, *assimilation* and the *hybrid scheme*.

Difference is the value embraced by the pluralist. In applying this motif to the woman's movement it would seem to affirm sexual distinctiveness and recognize a richness of possibility. The danger of this perspective is one of separatism and withdrawal, which has a base in the realities of the liberation struggle. The assimilation approach is like the proverbial "melting pot" idea. Women are directed to mount a campaign for the material rewards on par with men. The equal pay for equal work maxim, the vision of not being different in relation to existing structures and practices guides the assimilationist. Here, there is no attempt to socially critique the roots of prejudicial treatment, no sensitivity to the durability of stereotypes locked into institutions. Finally, we have a hybrid perspective, which combines the other two approaches and adds something new. It is this understanding, in my opinion, which offers the greatest possibility for unifying the movement and solidifying goals.

In a most provocative essay Hilde Hein ("Women: On Liberation from Expectations," *Soundings*, 1974) brings substance to the vision of a new, hybrid way. She argues that women are so limited in their role definitions that when they are released from the traditional one (reproductive) they are free:

"... the abandonment of these expectations leaves a vacuum ... this liberation from expectations, with all its attendant pain and uncertainties, is a blessing. Freed from the admittedly expedient and secure channelization of their being, women may be, for the first time in history, the only free beings."

Rossi's model translated into programmatic terms would suggest economic, sexual and family changes of a fairly radical order. The pluralistic model parallels woman's need to break economically from the dependence on men, to be her autonomous self. Through job restructuring, flexitime, equitable compensation, and an end to discrimination, women may become "separate but equal." There has been some discussion of androgyny, an overlapping of psycho-sexual identities, among women. This transcending of the biological imperative bears some resemblance to the assimilation objective. Increasingly, the sexual activity of women is being freed from the probability of pregnancy. The hybrid approach, once again, recommends that which has not been tried. Without precedent, but emerging, are family roles which test the possibility of "parenting" children (thereby going beyond the cult of motherhood), and discard the overriding commitment to have children. From this non-compulsive patterning of persons, hopefully, a commitment to

loving interaction, free from power and authority will spring forth.

Early in the suffrage campaign a black woman by the name of Sojourner Truth addressed a convention in Ohio (1851). She had not been asked by the leaders, because they feared her racial difference would dissuade some of the audience from their cause. At one point in the meeting, it became evident that her skills were needed. She spoke the following words, which some will recognize, and some will see as the source of my title:

If the first woman God ever made was strong enough to turn the world upside down all alone, these women together . . . ought to be able to turn it back, and get it right side up again. And now they are asking to do it, and the men better let 'em.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Erikson, Erik. "Inner and Outer Space: Reflections on Womanhood." In *The Woman in America*, edited by Robert Lifton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.
- Galbraith, John. *Economics and the Public Purpose*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
- Hein, Hilde. "Women: on Liberation from Expectations." *Soundings*, 1974.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. "A Review of Sex Role Research." In *Changing Women in a Changing Society*, edited by Joan Huber. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Papanek, Hanna. "Men, Women, and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career." In Huber, *supra*.
- Parsons, Talcott, and R. Bales. *Family Socialization and Interaction Process*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1953.
- Rossi, Alice. "Sex Equality: The Beginnings of Ideology." *Humanist*, 1969.
- Truth, Sojourner. "Speech." In *Voices from Women's Liberation*, edited by Leslie Tanner. New York: NAL, 1970.

# GUIDELINES FOR EQUAL TREATMENT OF THE SEXES IN MCGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY PUBLICATIONS

Editor's note: *McGraw-Hill Book Company has decided to implement the following guidelines for equal treatment of the sexes in their publications. The specific purpose of the guidelines is to eliminate sexist assumptions from Mc Graw-Hill publications and to encourage a greater freedom for all individuals to pursue their interests and realize their potentials.*

*Though the guidelines have been designed for implementation within one major publishing company, they provide MCR readers the opportunity to examine the role language has played in reinforcing inequality. They, moreover, indicate positive approaches toward providing fair, accurate, and balanced treatment of both sexes in human communications. While not all readers will agree with nor adopt these guidelines, it is hoped that all will find useful insights pursuant to human liberation.*

## INTRODUCTION

The word *sexism* was coined, by analogy to *racism*, to denote discrimination based on gender. In its original sense, *sexism* referred to prejudice against the female sex. In a broader sense, the term now indicates any arbitrary stereotyping of males and females on the basis of their gender. Women as well as men have been leaders and heroes, explorers and pioneers, and have made notable contributions to science, medicine, law, business, politics, civics, economics, literature, the arts, sports, and other areas of endeavor. Books dealing with subjects like these, as well as general histories, should acknowledge the achievements of women. The fact that women's rights, opportunities, and accomplishments have been limited by the social customs and conditions of their time should be openly discussed whenever relevant to the topic at hand.

We realized that the language of literature cannot be prescribed. The recommendations in these guidelines, thus, are intended primarily for use in teaching materials, reference works, and nonfiction works in general.

## NONSEXIST TREATMENT OF WOMEN AND MEN

1. Men and women should be treated primarily as people, and not primarily as members of opposite sexes. Their shared humanity and common attributes should be stressed—not their gender difference. Neither sex should be stereotyped or arbitrarily assigned to a leading or secondary role.

a. Though many women will continue to choose traditional occupations such as homemaker or secretary, women should not be type-cast in these roles but shown in a wide variety of professions and trades: as doctors and dentists, not always as nurses; as principals and professors, not always as teachers; as lawyers and judges, not always as social workers; as bank presidents, not always as tellers; as members of Congress, not always as members of the League of Women Voters.

b. Similarly, men should not be shown as constantly subject to the “masculine mystique” in their interests, attitudes, or careers. They should not be made to feel that their self-worth depends entirely upon their income level or the status level of their jobs. They should not be conditioned to believe that a man ought to earn more than a woman or that he ought to be the sole support of a family.

c. An attempt should be made to break job stereotypes for both women and men. No job should be considered sex-typed, and it should never be implied that certain jobs are incompatible with a woman’s “femininity” or a man’s “masculinity.” Thus, women as well as men should be shown as accountants, engineers, pilots, plumbers, bridge-builders, computer operators, TV repairers, and astronauts, while men as well as women should be shown as nurses, grade-school teachers, secretaries, typists, librarians, file clerks, switchboard operators, and baby sitters.

Women within a profession should be shown at all professional levels, including the top levels. Women should be portrayed in positions of authority over men and over other women, and there should be no implication that a man loses face or that a woman faces difficulty if the employer or supervisor is a woman. All work should be treated as honorable and worthy of respect; no job or job choices should be downgraded. Instead, women and men should be offered more options than were available to them when work was stereotyped by sex.

d. Books designed for children at the pre-school, elementary, and secondary levels should show married women who work outside the home and should treat them favorably. Teaching materials should not assume or imply that most women are wives who are also full-time mothers, but should instead emphasize the fact that women have



choices about their marital status, just as men do: that some women choose to stay permanently single and some are in no hurry to marry; that some women marry but do not have children, while others marry, have children, and continue to work outside the home. Thus, a text might say that some married people have children and some do not, and that sometimes *one or both parents* work outside the home. Instructional materials should never imply that all women have a "mother instinct" or that the emotional life of a family suffers because a woman works. Instead they might state that when both parents work outside the home there is usually either greater sharing of the child-rearing activities or reliance on day-care centers, nursery schools, or other help.

According to Labor Department statistics for 1972, over 42 per cent of all mothers with children under 18 worked outside the home, and about a third of these working mothers had children under 6. Publications ought to reflect this reality.

Both men and women should be shown engaged in home maintenance activities, ranging from cooking and house-cleaning to washing the car and making household repairs. Sometimes the man should be shown preparing the meals, doing the laundry, or diapering the baby, while the woman builds bookcases or takes out the trash.

*e.* Girls should be shown as having, and exercising, the same options as boys in their play and career choices. In school materials, girls should be encouraged to show an interest in mathematics, mechanical skills, and active sports, for example, while boys should never be made to feel ashamed of an interest in poetry, art, or music, or an aptitude for cooking, sewing, or child care. Course materials should be addressed to students of both sexes. For example, home economics courses should apply to boys as well as girls, and shop to girls as well as boys. Both males and females should be shown in textbook illustrations depicting career choices.

When as a practical matter it is known that a book will be used primarily by women for the life of the edition (say, the next five years), it is pointless to pretend that the readership is divided equally between males and females. In such cases it may be more beneficial to address the book fully to women and exploit every opportunity (1) to point out to them a broader set of options than they might otherwise have considered, and (2) to encourage them to aspire to a more active, assertive, and policymaking role than they might otherwise have thought of.

*f.* Women and girls should be portrayed as active participants in the same proportion as men and boys in stories, examples, problems, illustrations, discussion questions, test items, and exercises, regardless of subject matter. Women should not be stereotyped in

examples by being spoken of only in connection with cooking, sewing, shopping, and similar activities.

2. Members of both sexes should be represented as whole human beings with *human* strengths and weaknesses, not masculine or feminine ones.

a. Women and girls should be shown as having the same abilities, interests, and ambitions as men and boys. Characteristics that have been traditionally praised in males—such as boldness, initiative, and assertiveness—should also be praised in females. Characteristics that have been praised in females—such as gentleness, compassion, and sensitivity—should also be praised in males.

b. Like men and boys, women and girls should be portrayed as independent, active, strong, courageous, competent, decisive, persistent, serious-minded, and successful. They should appear as logical thinkers, problem-solvers, and decision makers. They should be shown as interested in their work, pursuing a variety of career goals, and both deserving of and receiving public recognition for their accomplishments.

c. Sometimes men should be shown as quiet and passive, or fearful and indecisive, or illogical and immature. Similarly women should sometimes be shown as tough, aggressive, and insensitive. Stereotypes of the logical, objective male and the emotional, subjective female are to be avoided. In descriptions, the smarter, braver, or more successful person should be a woman or girl as often as a man or boy. In illustrations, the taller, heavier, stronger, or more active person should not always be male, especially when children are portrayed.

3. Women and men should be treated with the same respect, dignity, and seriousness. Neither should be trivialized or stereotyped, either in text or in illustrations. Women should not be described by physical attributes when men are being described by mental attributes or professional position. Instead, both sexes should be dealt with in the same terms. References to a man's or a woman's appearance, charm, or intuition should be avoided when irrelevant.

*No*

Henry Harris is a shrewd lawyer and his wife Ann is a striking brunette.

*Yes*

The Harrises are an attractive couple. Henry is a handsome blond and Ann is a striking brunette.

OR

The Harrises are highly respected in their fields. Ann is an accomplished musician and Henry is a shrewd lawyer.

The Harrises are an interesting couple. Henry is a shrewd lawyer and Ann is very active in community ( *or* church *or* civic) affairs.

a. In descriptions of women, a patronizing or girl-watching tone should be avoided, as should sexual innuendoes, jokes, and puns. Examples of practices to be avoided: focusing on physical appearance (a buxom blonde); using special female-gender word forms (poetess, aviatrix, usherette); treating women as sex objects or portraying the typical woman as weak, helpless, or hysterical; making women figures of fun or objects of scorn and treating their issues as humorous or unimportant. Examples of stereotypes to be avoided: scatterbrained female, fragile flower, goddess on a pedestal, catty gossip, henpecking shrew, apron-wearing mother, frustrated spinster, ladylike little girl. Jokes at women's expense—such as the woman driver or nagging mother-in-law clichés—are to be avoided.

<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>the fair sex; the weaker sex</i>	<i>women</i>
<i>the distaff side</i>	<i>the female side or line</i>
<i>the girls or the ladies</i> (when adult females are meant)	<i>the women</i>
<i>girl</i> , as in: I'll have my <i>girl</i> check that.	I'll have my <i>secretary</i> (or my <i>assistant</i> ) check that. (Or use the person's name.)
<i>lady</i> used as a modifier; as in <i>lady lawyer</i>	<i>lawyer</i> (A woman may be identified simply through the choice of pronouns, as in: <i>The lawyer made her summation to the jury.</i> Try to avoid gender modifiers altogether. When you <i>must</i> modify; use <i>women</i> or <i>female</i> , as in: <i>a course on women writers</i> , or <i>the airline's first female pilot.</i> )
<i>the little woman; the better half; the ball and chain</i>	<i>wife</i>
female-gender word forms, such as <i>authoress</i> , <i>poetess</i> , <i>Jewess</i>	<i>author</i> , <i>poet</i> , <i>Jew</i>
female-gender or diminutive word forms, such as <i>suffragette</i> , <i>usherette</i> , <i>aviatrix</i>	<i>suffragist</i> , <i>usher</i> , <i>aviator</i> , (or <i>pilot</i> )
<i>libber</i> (a put-down)	<i>feminist</i> ; <i>liberationist</i>
<i>sweet young thing</i>	<i>young woman</i> ; <i>girl</i>
<i>co-ed</i> (as a noun)	<i>student</i>
<i>housewife</i>	<i>homemaker</i> for a person who works at home, or rephrase with a more inclusive term
<i>career girl</i> or <i>career woman</i>	name the woman's profession: <i>attorney Ellen Smith</i> ; <i>Marie Sanchez, a journalist</i> or <i>editor</i> or <i>business executive</i> or <i>doctor</i> or <i>lawyer</i> or <i>agent</i>

*cleaning woman, cleaning lady, or maid*

*housekeeper; house or office cleaner*

The sound of the drilling disturbed the *housewives* in the neighborhood.

The sound of the drilling disturbed *every-*one within earshot (or everyone in the neighborhood).

*Housewives* are feeling the pinch of higher prices.

*Consumers* (customers or shoppers) are feeling the pinch of higher prices.

(Note: Logically, *co-ed* should refer to any student at a co-educational college or university. Since it does not, it is a sexist term.)

b. In descriptions of men, especially men in the home, references to general ineptness should be avoided. Men should not be characterized as dependent on women for meals, or clumsy in household maintenance, or as foolish in self-care. To be avoided: characterizations that stress men's dependence on women for advice on what to wear and what to eat, inability of men to care for themselves in times of illness, and men as objects of fun (the henpecked husband).

c. Women should be treated as part of the rule, not as the exception. Generic terms, such as doctor and nurse, should be assumed to include both men and women, and modified titles such as "woman doctor" or "male nurse," should be avoided. Work should never be stereotyped as "woman's work" or as "a man-sized job." Writers should avoid showing a "gee-whiz" attitude toward women who perform competently; ("Though a woman, she ran the business as well as any man" or "Though a woman, she ran the business efficiently.")

d. Women should be spoken of as participants in the action, not as possessions of the men. Terms such as *pioneer*, *farmer*, and *settler* should not be used as though they applied only to adult males.

*No*

Pioneers moved West; taking their wives and children with them.

*Yes*

Pioneer families moved West.

Pioneer men and women (or pioneer couples) moved West, taking their children with them.

e. Women should not be portrayed as needing male permission in order to act or to exercise rights (except, or course, for historical or factual accuracy).

*No*

Jim Weiss allows his wife to work part-time.

*Yes*

Judy Weiss works part-time.

4. Women should be recognized for their own achievements. Intelligent, daring, and innovative women, both in history and in fiction, should be provided as role-models for girls, and leaders in the

fight for women's rights should be honored and respected, not mocked or ignored.

5. In references to humanity at large, language should operate to include women and girls. Terms that tend to exclude females should be avoided whenever possible.

a. The word *man* has long been used not only to denote a person of male gender, but also generically to denote humanity at large. To many people today, however, the word *man* has become so closely associated with the first meaning (a male human being) that they consider it no longer broad enough to be applied to any person or to human beings as a whole. In deference to this position, alternative expressions should be used in place of *man* (or derivative constructions used generically to signify humanity at large) whenever such substitutions can be made without producing an awkward or artificial construction. In cases where *man*-made words must be used, special efforts should be made to ensure that pictures and other devices make explicit that such references include women. Here are some possible substitutions for *man*-words:

	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
	mankind	humanity, human beings, human race, people
	primitive man	primitive people or peoples; primitive human beings; primitive men and women
	man's achievements	human achievements
	If a man drove 50 miles at 50 mph . . .	If a person (or driver drove 50 miles at 60 mph . . . )
	the best man for the job	the best person (or candidate) for the job
	manmade	artificial; synthetic, manufactured; constructed; of human origin
	manpower	human power; human energy; workers; workforce
	grow to manhood	grow to adulthood; grow to manhood or womanhood

b. The English language lacks a generic singular pronoun signifying *he* or *she*, and therefore it has been customary and grammatically sanctioned to use masculine pronouns in expressions such as "one . . . *he*," "anyone . . . *he*," and "each child open *his* book." Nevertheless, avoid when possible the pronouns *he*, *him*, and *his* in reference to the hypothetical person or humanity in general. Various alternatives may be considered:

(1) Reword to eliminate unnecessary gender pronouns.

<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
The average American drinks his coffee black.	The average American drinks black coffee.

(2) Recast into the plural.	Most Americans drink their coffee black.
-----------------------------	--

(3) Replace the masculine pronoun with *one*, *you*, *he* or *she*, *her* or *his*, as appropriate. (Use *he* or *she* and its variations sparingly to avoid clumsy prose.)

(4) Alternate male and female expressions and examples.

<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
I've often heard supervisors say, "He's not the right man for the job," or "He lacks the qualifications for success."	I've often heard supervisors say, "She's not the right person for the job," or "He lacks the qualifications for success."

(5) To avoid severe problems of repetition or inept wording, it may sometimes be best to use the generic *he* freely, but to add, in the preface and as often as necessary in the text, emphatic statements to the effect that the masculine pronouns are being used for succinctness and are intended to refer to both females and males.

These guidelines can only suggest a few solutions to difficult problems of rewording. The proper solution in any given passage must depend on the context and on the author's intention. For example, it would be wrong to pluralize in contexts stressing a one-to-one relationship, as between teacher and child. In such cases, the expression *he or she* or either *he* or *she* appropriate will be acceptable.

c. Occupational terms ending in *man* should be replaced whenever possible by terms that can include members of either sex unless they refer to a particular person.

<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
congressman	member of Congress; representative (but Congressman Koch and Congresswoman Holzman)
businessman	business executive; business manager
fireman	firefighter
mailman	mail carrier; letter carrier
salesman	sales representative; salesperson; sales clerk
insurance man	insurance agent
statesman	leader; public servant
chairman	the person presiding at (or chairing) a meeting; the presiding officer; the chair; head; leader; coordinator; moderator
cameraman	camera operator
foreman	supervisor

d. Language that assumes all readers are male should be avoided.

No	Yes
you and your wife	you and your spouse
when you shave in the morning	when you brush your teeth (or wash up) in the morning

6. The language used to designate and describe females and males should treat the sexes equally.

a. Parallel language should be used for women and men.

No	Yes
the men and the ladies	the men and the women the ladies and the gentlemen the girls and the boys
man and wife	husband and wife

Note that *lady* and *gentlemen*, *wife* and *husband*, and *mother* and *father* are role words. *Ladies* should be used for women only when men are being referred to as *gentlemen*. Similarly, women should be called *wives* and *mothers* only when men are referred to as *husbands* and *fathers*. Like a male shopper, a woman in a grocery store should be called a *customer*, not a *housewife*.

b. Women should be identified by their own names (e.g., Indira Gandhi). They should not be referred to in terms of their roles as wife, mother, sister, or daughter unless it is in these roles that they are significant in context. Nor should they be identified in terms of their marital relationships (Mrs. Gandhi) unless this brief form is stylistically more convenient (than, say Prime Minister Gandhi) or is paired up with similar references to men.

(1) A woman should be referred to by name in the same way that a man is. Both should be called by their full names, by first or last name only, or by title.

No	Yes
Bobby Riggs and Billie Jean	Bobby Riggs and Billie Jean King
Billie Jean and Riggs	Billie Jean and Bobby
Mrs. King and Riggs	King and Riggs Ms. King (because she prefers Ms.) and Mr. Riggs
Mrs. Meir and Moshe Dayan	Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan or Mrs. Meir and Mr. Dayan

(2) Unnecessary reference to or emphasis on a woman's marital status should be avoided. Whether married or not, a woman may be referred to by the name by which she chooses to be known, whether her name is her original name or her married name.

c. Whenever possible, a term should be used that includes both sexes. Unnecessary references to gender should be avoided

No	Yes
college boys and co-eds	students

d. Insofar as possible, job titles should be nonsexist. Different nomenclature should not be used for the same job depending on whether it is held by a male or by a female. (See also paragraph 5c for additional examples of words ending in *man*.)

No	Yes
steward or purser or stewardess	flight attendant
policeman and policewoman	police officer
maid and houseboy	house or office cleaner, servant

e. Different pronouns should not be linked with certain work or occupations on the assumption that the worker is always (or usually) female or male. Instead either pluralize or use *he or she* and *she or he*.

No	Yes
the consumer or shopper . . . she	consumers or shoppers . . . they
the secretary . . . she	secretaries . . . they
the breadwinner . . . his earnings	the breadwinner . . . his or her earnings or breadwinners . . . their earnings.

f. Males should not always be first in order of mention. Instead, alternate the order, sometimes using: *women and men, gentlemen and ladies, she or he, her or his*.

## CONCLUSION

It is hoped that these guidelines have alerted authors and staff members to the problems of sex discrimination and to various ways of solving them.



**AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRAVEL  
WITH THOSE WHO WILL**

*The man who goes alone can start  
today; but he who travels with  
another must wait till that other  
is ready.*

*—Henry David Thoreau*

# LIBERATION, NOT SEPARATION

C. Anne Davis

Of all the themes in human history, none seems to capture the imagination as do those which recount people's struggles for freedom. These historical accounts allow persons to share the strong emotions of such a struggle while participating from a point of objectivity. Serious study of these freedom struggles reveals that each had its unique set of goals. These goals were usually very specific. Man long ago learned that real freedom is experienced in specifics only.

Freedom goals usually reflect a struggle for "freedom from" and a further step of "freedom to." Sometimes the struggle becomes so complex and costly that the struggle terminates with the "freedom from" phase and never moves to the "free to" phase. The former claims victory at the point of separation. The latter claims continuous victory in gaining access to unity in freedom.

The "free from" level is characteristic of the adolescent life stage. The adolescent struggles to be free from his parents. The adolescent wants to live out this freedom in the context of other adolescents. They verbalize vehemently their protest against interdependency.<sup>1</sup>

The "free to" stage is characteristic of the adult life possibilities. Having moved through a need for separation, the emerging adult is able to choose to share freedom with his parents—the very people who were once the adversaries.

The focus of this paper is analogous to the "free to" phase in human growth and development. *Liberation, Not Separation* sounds a clear hope that the current struggle for recognition of women's rights will not terminate in the adolescent phase of "freedom from." The current movement for recognition of women's rights is facing its crucible at this very point. The choices are fixation in adolescence or growing through adolescence and claiming adult possibilities. The choice of freedom in unity will not be an easy one. Adolescence is never easy to pass through and leave behind. Even the strongest young people and parents find it painful and depleting. The same is true of the movements.

The first creative step in facilitating this unity, through outgrowing simple separation, is an attempt to begin to identify the issues

---

<sup>1</sup> Irene M. Josselyn, *The Adolescent and His World* (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1952) p. 38.

---

C. Anne Davis is Assistant Professor and Acting Director of Social Work Education at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. Professor Davis' article, "Liberation, not Separation," is used with permission of the editor of the *Review and Expositor*, Winter 1975 issue, a quarterly theological journal published by the faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

involved. No person will be left untouched by the outcomes of the struggle for women's rights. It is important, therefore, that every person seriously think through the issues, because unity in freedom must, by its nature, be a mutual giving and receiving of gifts of people to people; it cannot be won.

The first issues for the Christian are theological. The theological issues are the touchstones that determine which other items become issues. Two basic theological issues, unity and relationship, need to be explored to form separation.

Unity is defined here as the quality of a whole which is a union of related parts. Unity in a theological context speaks to a quality of relationship of the people of God in Christ. In both the Old and New Testaments, Christians are provided instructions and guidance in the context and processes which are integral to the building of unity among people. The scriptures also clearly describe the nature of the community of faith in and through which the Christian grows in freedom-in unity with others.

Christians are called to unity in Christ. For the believer, this unity is a quality of wholeness in all of creation. It is that peculiar union with Christ which gives the Christian the possibility to relate to people in a fashion which seems foolish to the world. The world sees this unity as foolish largely because it is different from cultural expectations. First, it acknowledges that there are individual differences in persons. However, having declared the existence of differences, the biblical writers hasten to establish the fact that these differences are not criteria for assessing the worth of a person. The theology of unity states that individual differences are to be seen as positive possibilities for the creation of a whole community. Second, while capacities and gifts differ from person to person, there is a need for each person's capacity and gifts. Scripture makes it clear that in the family of God one person can never say to another, "I do not need you."

Theologically, then, Christians are called to relate to people in a unity which is based on a new way of looking at individual differences and individual gifts. What does this mean to the struggle for human rights? It means that while men and women are different and have different gifts, this does not form a basis for separation. Unity does not put man or woman in his place or her place. Rather it establishes the position that God has created a place for every person. It further clarifies that these places are interrelated, interdependent, essential, and purposeful in the coming of the Kingdom. Freedom as separation of people from people does not fare well in the biblical context.

If Christians are called to unity in Christ and to relate to people in a unity that affirms gifts and allows for positive utilization of differences, how is this relationship actualized? The process of

relationship is one of the simplest, and yet most complex of human potentialities. Also it is the modality through which both sin and redemption entered the realm of human possibility. For in its most common denominator, sin is the spoiling of relationships. Sin is basically the spoiling of our relationship to God, but our relations to our fellow human beings and to ourselves are radically affected also.<sup>2</sup>

Relationship is also the modality through which redemption comes to a person. Redemption comes through a restoration of a right relationship with God. The restoration of this ultimate relationship opens the way for relationships to be established, restored, and refined among persons. And, if restoration of a right relationship with God is the way of redemption, it stands to reason that relationship is central to facilitating growth toward freedom in unity among persons.

But it also should be noted that the kind of relationship being discussed here has unique characteristics. These characteristics are not usually present in most relationships because most people are never seriously taught the "how to" of Christian relationships. Consequently, most people are taught a cultural-oral-tradition form of relationship skills into which they try to inject Christian outcomes.

A move away from the relationship style of cultural heritage and a move toward the biblical relationship style means a move toward unity in freedom between men and women. As Dr. Allen Keith-Lucas points out, a biblical relationship style is one which is characterized by unconditional love, by being reality based, by being mutual, by offering acceptance and by not being consistently pleasant.<sup>3</sup> In support of this thesis, several selected comparisons will be drawn between the two styles. Examples will be used which demonstrate the application of the two styles to the woman in our church and society.

First, the biblical relationship style calls for the application of unconditional love. Unconditional love, the concept of *agape*—the love which gives—is the only sort of Christian union between persons available in this 'world.'<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, the dominant culture heritage calls for a relationship which gives to those who deserve receiving and withholds from the undeserving.<sup>5</sup> Separating the deserving from the undeserving is based on culturally established criteria. These criteria are derived by translating cultural values into acts of behavior. These acts of behavior then become the basis for receiving and giving love. The contradiction in these two concepts of love is obvious.

---

<sup>2</sup> Culbert G. Rutenber, *The Reconciling Gospel* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1960) p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> Allen Keith-Lucas, *Giving and Taking Help* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1972) p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> A.M. Hunter, *Introducing New Testament Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1957) p. 138.

<sup>5</sup> Karl de Schweinitz, *England's Road to Social Security* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1943) p. 157.

For the human liberation question, the cultural relationship style focuses its response on an assessment of how well the person lives out cultural expectations. There is little regard for whether the cultural expectation makes the actor a free person or a slave. There is even less regard for the ultimate outcome of separation of people or the ultimate outcome of unity in freedom. The cultural relationship style, for example, would reduce the issue of the rights of women to a simple assessment of how well a woman fills certain culturally sanctioned role expectations.

The biblical relationship style on the other hand, raises the issue to a complex examination of personhood and an unconditional love response to a child of God. This calls for responses which see beyond male and female, black and white, and rich and poor to a common bond of human existence. To focus the issue at a lesser level is to reduce the possibilities of unity and to increase the possibilities of separation.

If one accepts the doctrine of unconditional love, one also has to confront the doctrine of grace. And, beyond a mere acceptance of the doctrine of grace, grace itself must come to expression in daily relationships. This calls for allowance to be made for acceptance of every individual's right to existence, importance, value, and power.<sup>6</sup> Carl Rogers describes this acceptance as non-possessive caring.<sup>7</sup>

Secondly, the biblical relationship is based on reality. While it is a relationship of unconditional love and grace, it never fails to recognize and to deal with hard realities of life. Once an individual experiences unconditional love and realizes that behavior is not the commodity to be used to earn love, that individual is released to deal with realities in the context of love with the sole purpose of producing healthy repentance and redemptive growth. It is that "while we were yet sinners" — love which sets healing processes into motion. Cultural relationship style by contrast reverses the process. It calls for coming to terms with another's expectations and then being loved. It sets no redemptive process in motion.

But what does this say about the topic of this paper? It speaks to the causal factors for one of the most insidious aspects of the whole problem of human rights. The aspect is the inability of many men to deal openly and directly with women when there are hard realities to be discussed. The cultural relationship style calls for a distorted "theology of niceness." The only alternative to this dilemma is for the participants to operate from a bilevel position of honesty. In other words, the face-to-face encounters, primary relationships, are kept "nice." At the counterpoint, the non-face-to-face relationships carry all

---

<sup>6</sup> Naomi Brill, *Working With People: The Helping Process* (Toronto: J.B. Lippincott, 1973) p. 48.

<sup>7</sup> Carl R. Rogers, *Freedom to Learn* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969) p. 109.

the diverted hostility, anger, and generalized frustration. This pattern is described as a passive-aggressive behavior pattern by behavioral scientists.<sup>8</sup> This means that a person may be treated like a king or queen in face-to-face relations while in non-face-to-face relations, he/she becomes the least in the kingdom. This is one possible explanation of how people can be simultaneously treated and mistreated. In the business world, a woman can easily be misled when men tend to over-protect her in the hard business discussions. If she is wise, she will not be surprised to learn that she was really "clobbered" in some later-non-face-to-face circumstance. (It should be noted here that this problem is present in many human relationships.)

The biblical relationship calls for leaving behind this passive-aggressive response pattern; too few human beings are kings and queens to make it productive. The fact that the biblical relationship is reality-based calls for an individualized approach to persons, be they male or female, and a response to the reality of the individual created by God. Such a style allows for acknowledgement that a particular man or woman is capable of dealing with the hard parts of life. This acknowledgement is one of life's most significant affirmations. It says to a person, "I trust your capacity to live life." All of this can be done without having to call the love base of the relationship into question. The undisturbed and unthreatened base of love makes it all possible. The facing of reality becomes redemptive in the context of unconditional love. It produces a sense of unity in freedom.

Lastly, the biblical relationship is a mutual relationship of people to people. It is unique in that it depicts power not as something to grasp and to hold to increase the influence of the holder. Christ was all powerful and yet he insisted on not using this power to build a reputation. The disciples had great difficulty in conceptualizing this view of power. Twentieth century men and women have done no better. The willing giving up of power for another's well-being is a Christian principle which is indeed unique. In the cultural relationship style it is virtually taboo. In fact, this style is based on a massing of power, intricate systems of power exchanges, and complex strategies for power removal. Social scientists describe human beings as power-hungry, pursuing objectives through whatever modes of power are available.<sup>9</sup>

For the focus of this paper, two notions need consideration. First, most groups in their struggle for recognition see themselves as

---

<sup>8</sup> O. Spurgeon English and Stuart M. Finch, *Introduction to Psychiatry* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1964) p. 255.

<sup>9</sup> Robert M. MacIver, *Power Transformed* (New York: The Macmillan, 1964) p. 123.

powerless. This may be the way they feel, but it is a distortion of reality and an abdication of adult responsibility. Secondly, for every powerless feeling, that group must identify another group and attribute to that group all power. This all-powerful group becomes "the enemy." This is a distortion also. No group is ever all-powerful.

Having said this, women bear responsibility for acknowledging that they are powerful and that they should cease playing the powerless game. Men must begin to acknowledge that they have power but not all power. When this happens, there is the possibility that the mutual willingness to give up power for the other's good can be actualized in a redemptive encounter.

These several points of comparison of the biblical relationship style and the cultural style have been offered as support for the thesis that a move toward biblical relationship style will mean a move toward unity in freedom for men and women. Having looked at the theological and relational issues involved, it is necessary to focus on an examination of key church and denominational structures as they either encourage or hinder freedom in unity.

Church and denominational structures hinder freedom in unity to the extent that they reflect cultural values and cultural relational styles, and to the extent that they misuse power. Church and denominational structures which confirm prevailing secular values forfeit their prophetic role.<sup>10</sup> They facilitate freedom in unity to the extent that they reflect Christian values, biblical relational style, and to the extent that they view power as something to give up willingly in order to set redemptive processes in motion under God's leadership.

Several pitfalls seem to entrap us in our efforts to be the church. First, there is the tendency to transmit the cultural male-female identifications into church structures. This is easier than thinking through new ones which are based on Christian maturity, individual competency, personal commitment, and willingness. An example of this is evident in many church and denominational committee and board memberships. Finance and administrative committees usually carry male identifications. Missions and childhood education have historically carried female identification. These identities often result in freedom in separation. The men handle their tasks. The women handle their tasks. Consequently, the masculine and feminine complementarity is lost. The end result is half a loaf.

Many churches are moving away from these separate identities. Churches are beginning to see that the religious education of children needs the gifts of men and women. Acceptance of the capacity of

---

<sup>10</sup> John Lee Eighmy, *Churches in Cultural Captivity* (Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1972) p. 20.



women to make contributions to financial judgments and administrative decisions has been slower in coming. However, progress is being made.

The church business meeting, some committee responsibilities, and the congregational form of church polity are all very positive in facilitating the concept of freedom in unity. It is deplorable that many women have been unwilling to share their gifts where opportunities already exist to do so. Many women have been content to really believe they have no gifts of judgment.

Secondly, there is the tendency to view the current state of church and denominational structures as healthy since the "letter of the law" does not seem problematic. Current structures allow for men and women to make their contributions. However, "standard operational procedures" become very problematic for women. These procedures tend toward letting women handle women's work while letting men handle the real world.

Lastly, there is the tendency to want to "make up our minds before we make up our lives."<sup>11</sup> To ask for either kind of freedom is to ask for growth, fulfillment, and eventual satisfaction. Not much in our past has prepared people for freedom or the unknown.<sup>12</sup> Dr. John Claypool believes that in the face of freedom, human nature wants to know how it will all end prior to taking the first steps of action. He goes on to say that this dilemma faced man and woman in the Garden of Eden. For, even in the face of the possibility of fully participating in all creation, they chose to seek first the ultimate explanation of all things. In other words, they wanted to make up their minds before they made up their lives. Dr. Claypool states that Christians, through faith, must dare to make up their lives and then make up their minds.<sup>13</sup>

The church stands in danger of not facing the issue of the role of women by waiting. If the church waits until culture has brought in a solution, the structures will again be reactive rather than proactive. The church may again miss an opportunity to give leadership.

In summary, men and women are different just as all individuals are different. People are different in order to be united into a family of God. The biblical concept of relationship is the modality through which we can attain this unity in freedom. To settle for less is to settle for separation — a lonely, estranged freedom. To claim unity in freedom is to allow for the possibility of being free to choose to share our gifts to actualize a community of faith under God.

---

<sup>11</sup> John R. Claypool, *Tracks of a Fellow Struggler* (Waco: Word Books, 1974) p. 30.

<sup>12</sup> Joseph Simins and Jeannie Reidy, *The Risk of Loving* (New York: Seabury Press, 1973) p. 144.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 145.



**LIBERATION IS A JOURNEY  
NOT A DESTINATION**

**AND ALONG THE WAY  
THERE ARE**

**QUESTIONS  
KNOWLEDGE  
CHANGE**

**AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO WALK  
WITH THOSE WHO WILL**

## SUGGESTED READINGS AND RESOURCES

### Bibliographies

- Cisler, Lucinda, "Women: A Bibliography," Xeroxed. Available from author, 50¢ prepaid: 102 W. 80 St., New York, N.Y. 10024.
- Fischer, Clare B. "Woman: A Theological Perspective," Xeroxed. Available from Office of Women's Affairs of the Graduate Theological Union, \$2.00 prepaid: 2465 Le Conte Avenue, Berkeley, California 94709.

### Books

- Bently-Doely, Sarah. *Women's Liberation and the Church*. New York: Association Press, 1970.
- Bernard, Jessie. *The Future of Marriage*. New York: World Publishing Co., 1972.
- Bliss, Kathleen. *The Service and Status of Women in the Churches*. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Bullough, Vern L. *The Service and Status of Women in the Churches*. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Bullough, Vern L. *The Subordinate Sex: A History of Attitudes Toward Women*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Carothers, J. Edward; Mead, Margaret; Mc Cracken, Daniel D.; Shinn, Roger, eds. *To Love or to Perish: The Technological Crisis and the Churches*. New York: Friendship Press, 1972.
- Crook, Margaret B. *Women and Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Culver, Elsie T. *Women in the World of Religion*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1967.
- Daly, Mary. *The Church and the Second Sex*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- . *Beyond God the Father*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1974.
- Doely, Sarah Bentley, ed. *Women's Liberation and the Church*. New York: Association Press, 1970.
- Dumas, Francine. *Man and Woman: Similarity and Differences*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1966.
- Emswiler, Sharon Neuffer, and Emswiler, Thomas Neuffer. *Women and Worship: A Guide to Non-Sexist Hymns, Prayers and Liturgies*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Ermath, Margaret. *Adam's Fractured Rib*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Farians, Elizabeth. *The Double Cross: Writings on Women and Religion, 1967-1972*. Cincinnati: National Organization for Women, 1972.
- Figes, Eva. *Partriarchal Attitudes*. New York: Stein and Day, 1970.

- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. *Women and Economics*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Goldenberg, Judith (Editor). *Women in Religion, 1972*. American Academy of Religion, 1973.
- Goode, William J. *Women in Divorce*. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- Hays, H.R. *The Dangerous Sex*. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1964.
- Hewitt, Emily C. and Suzanne Hiatt. *Women Priests: Yes or No?* New York: Seabury, 1973.
- Hole, Judith and Ellen Levine. *The Church in Rebirth of Feminism*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1972.
- Harkness, Georgia. *Women in Church and Society*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Joneway, Elizabeth. *Man's World-Woman's Place: A Study of Social Mythology*. New York: William Morrow, 1971.
- Mc Kenna, Mary Lawrence. *Women of the Church: Role and Renewal*. New York: Kenedy and Sons, 1967.
- Morgan, Robin (Editor). *Sisterhood Is Powerful*. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.
- Morris, Joan. *The Lady Was a Bishop*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1973.
- Myrdal, Alva, and Klein, Viola. *Women's Two Roles, Home and Work*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.
- O'Brien, Patricia. *The Woman Alone*. New York: Quadrangle Press, 1973.
- Prohl, R. *Women in the Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmann, 1967.
- Ruether, Rosemary R., ed. *Religion and Sexism*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974.
- Roszak, Betty, and Theodore Roszak (Editors). *Masculine/Feminine: Readings in Sexual Mythology and the Liberation of Women*. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Stendahl, Krister. *The Bible and the Role of Women: A Case Study in Hermeneutics*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Swidler, Arlene, ed. *Sister Celebrations: Nine Worship Experiences*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Tavard, George. *Women in Christian Tradition*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1973.
- Taves, Isabella. *Women Alone*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968.
- Van Buren, Nancy. *The Subversion of Women As Practiced by Churches*. New York: Westminster Press, 1973.

## Films

*Editor's note:* These films may be rented from:

The Eccentric Circle  
Cinema Workshop  
P.O. Box 1481  
Evanston, Illinois 60204  
Tel. 312-864-0020

ANYTHING YOU WANT TO BE by Liane Brandon, 8-1/2 minutes, B/W (sale only): One of the most discussed women films to date. Portrays conflicts of a teenage girl who has the notion she can be "anything she wants to be." Treats society's prescribed feminine roles.

HAROLD AND CYNTHIA by Joh Strawbridge, 10 minutes, color, rental \$15: Two simple people trying to get together amidst badgering by advertisements which assure them of "the only way" to health, beauty and happiness.

MRS. COP by Joe De Cola, 16-1/2 minutes, color, rental \$25: Mary Ellen Abrecht works as a patrol sergeant on the Washington, D.C. police force. The film explores her feelings and special problems as she tries to work as a supervisor of men in this traditionally male role. Superb discussion starter. Opens issues in the career area.

THE SAGA OF MACRAME PARK by Ben Van Meter, 22 minutes, color, rental \$25: She is a weaver and the mother of three children. The film documents the planning and building of a playground in white rope macrome in her hometown, Belinas, California.

*Editor's note:* Consult Film Guide, November 1974, published by US Army Chaplain Board, Fort Meade, Maryland 20755 for listings and descriptions of films which are available. See, for example:

PSYCHOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SEXES  
(MF 16-5518)

WHO'S BOSS (MF 16-5016)

TO BE A PERSON (TF 16-4281)

TO BE A WOMAN (TF 16-4280)

TO BE MARRIED (TF 16-4282)

REMEMBER EDEN (MF 16-5709)

TUESDAY NIGHT IS THE LONELIEST NIGHT OF THE WEEK  
(MF 16-5585)

## CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Name \_\_\_\_\_

New Address \_\_\_\_\_

Old Address\_\_\_\_\_

Send to:

### Military Chaplain's Review

US Army Chaplain Board

Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755

★ ★

COMMENTS ABOUT THIS ISSUE OF THE *MCR*:

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

FRED C. WEYAND

*General, United States Army*  
*Chief of Staff*

Official:

VERNE L. BOWERS

*Major General, United States Army*  
*The Adjutant General*

DISTRIBUTION:

To be distributed in accordance with special mailing list.





DA PAM 165-106

MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW, SUMMER, 1975











